DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 062 CS 205 783

AUTHOR Stahlecker, James
TITLE Long Term Follow-up Report of Four BAWP Programs. Evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project. Technical Report.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 88p.: For related documents see CS 205 779-786. Appendixes may be marginally legible.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education: *Followup Studies: *Inservice Teacher Education: Postsecondary Education: *Program Effectiveness: *Program Evaluation: Student Attitudes: Surveys: *Teacher Attitudes: Teachers: *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Bay Area Writing Project

ABSTRACT

Prepared as part of the evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP), this report provides results of surveys evaluating four types of BAWP programs (elementary and secondary school-year inservice programs, university extension special courses, and summer invitational programs), showing that BAWP programs have long-term effects on student and teacher attitudes toward writing and writing instruction. The report contains descriptions of the four types of programs, the design of the study, the results, conclusions, and recommendations. The results section is divided into eight parts and provides information on demographic characteristics of BAWP participants, attendance, impact on students, impact on teachers, overall assessment of BAWP impact on teaching practices, district support, and presenting respondents' open-ended comments. Eight appendixes provide samples of the questionnaires and show frequencies of responses for the separate and combined cells of the surveys. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191062

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EVALUATION OF THE BAY AREA WRITING PROJECT

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Technical Report

Funded By
The Carnegie Corporation

1979

Evaluation Directed by
Michael Scriven
Director, Evaluation Institute
University of San Francisco
San Francisco, CA 94117

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael Scriven

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS205783

This report represents only ONE component of the total Evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project. The other Evaluation reports are available through the BAWP office. For an up-to-date list, including current prices, write

James R. Gray, Director
Bay Area Writing Project
School of Education
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

LONG TERM FOLLOW-UP REPORT
OF FOUR BAWP PROGRAMS

Written by Jim Stahlecker

Suggestions contributing to the final report were made by :

Barbara Davis, Catharine Keech, Michael Scriven and Susan Thomas

BAWP Evaluation Unit

July 1979

LONG TERM FOLLOW-UP REPORT

OF FOUR BAWP PROGRAMS

OVERVIEW AND FINDINGS

Participants in four types of BAWP programs were surveyed, representing elementary and secondary school-year inservices, University Extension special courses and the Summer Invitational Program. The groups were compared with each other, and also across years of BAWP experience in efforts to highlight not only differences which might occur with the various program offerings, but also to examine possible long-term effects of BAWP. The results, summarizing responses of participants from years 1974 to 1979, are as follows.

1) BAWP is currently reaching a fairly constant proportion of teachers from grade levels K-12 with 31% from grades K-6, 18% from grades 7-8, 43% from grades 9-12 and 8% from the post-high school level.

2) A majority of teachers (more than 75%) see their BAWP experiences as having increased their ability to relate theory to practice in the teaching of writing and increased their confidence and level of skill in teaching writing. A smaller percent (approximately 60%) see their BAWP experiences as having increased their own efficiency as a writer.

3) A majority of teachers (more than 75%) see the BAWP experiences as having increased their students' enjoyment and valuing of writing, and as having increased their students' confidence and overall skill in writing ability.

4) A majority of teachers (more than 75%) see the BAWP experiences as having an impact on increasing the frequency of their discussions about writing with fellow teachers. Only the Summer Invitational participants tend to report that the BAWP experience has increased their collaborative activities with other teachers, their program change activities (implementing new or revised writing programs, assisting with proficiency standards, etc.) or other professional activities related to the teaching of writing.

5) Individuals in the school year inservices and in the Extension courses do not report much subsequent involvement with BAWP (less than 8%), while a very large majority of Summer Invitational participants are involved subsequently with the BAWP programs.

6) A large majority of teachers (over 90%) indicate that the BAWP experience was of some use to them in the teaching of writing. The individuals rating the BAWP program most highly were those exposed to the Summer Invitational, while the less enthusiastic, but still <u>strongly</u> positive, ratings came from the individuals participating in the elementary inservices.

It is important to note, however, that elementary teachers attending inservices broader in scope -- K-12 or secondary emphasis --- rated the BAWP inservice program as highly as any other inservice participants.

7) Districts and schools were seen to be moderately supportive regarding implementation of change in writing programs, although several anecdotal comments indicated that this support varied by district and type of writing activities implemented.

SUMMARY

With only a few exceptions, this follow-up report shows that teachers are highly enthusiastic about the Bay Area Writing Project, and that they believe it to have an impact on their own teaching of writing, and in most cases, believe it to have an impact on students' enjoyment and valuing of writing. Moreover, the effects of BAWP do not seem to diminish over time even though many teachers do not have ongoing exposure to BAWP. Teachers attending early workshops and inservices are just as enthusiastic about the program as teachers reached by BAWP more recently.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations made by this report, though qualified by the fact that no absolute conclusions can be drawn from only one questionnaire survey, are as follows:

1) BAWP could more extensively advertise its many program options. Individuals exposed to BAWP school-year inservices could be made aware of the Summer Open program which runs concurrently with the Invitational Institute. Also, University Extension offerings could be advertised to all BAWP participants.

2) BAWP programs could not only disseminate promising practices of instruction for the individual classroom, but also provide suggestions for promoting writing program change throughout school and district curricula.

3) Greater effort could be made to "educate" administrators concerning the need for continuing support of inservice goals, not only during the course of the inservice, but once the inservice has ended. Previous research studies have indicated that programs and/or individual teacher practices have much less chance of survival without the active support and involvement of district and school administration.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer would like to acknowledge the cooperation of the BAWP Project Staff: James Gray, Miles Myers, Mary K. Healy and Keith Caldwell, as well as the many administrators and teachers who were of invaluable assistance in the formation of this study. Their time and cooperation have been most generous.

The work of collecting, processing and analyzing the data was assisted by:

Barbara Davis
John Carr
Susan Thomas
Mary Jorgenson
Patti Watson

Linda Sandusky assisted in preparing the final manuscript.

The entire report was prepared under the direction of Michael Scriven.

CONTENTS

	page
Summary	i
Acknowledgments	iii
Purpose of the Survey	1
Populations to be Surveyed	1
Description of the Four BAWP Programs Surveyed	
Summer Invitational Programs	3
School District Inservice Projects: Elementary and Secondary	6
University Extension Courses	7
Design of the Study	
Sample	8
Assignment to Cells	11
Nature of the Questionnaire	11
Administration of the Questionnaire	12
Results	
Demographic Characteristics of BAWP Participants	15
Attendance	17
Impact on Students	21
Impact on Teachers	23
Overall Assessment of BAWP	27
Impact on Teaching Practices	34
District Support	36
Open-Ended Comments	37
Conclusion	41
Recommendations	43
Refernce Notes	48

Appendices

		page
A	Survey Questionnaire and Frequency of Response for All Types of BAWP Programs Combined	49
B	Frequencies and Rankings on Question #9 for Each Type of BAWP Program Separately	53
C	Survey Questionnaire and Frequency of Response for Cell #1	54
D	Survey Questionnaire and Frequency of Response for Cell #2	58
E	Survey Questionnaire and Frequency of Response for Cell #3	62
F	Survey Questionnaire and Frequency of Response for Cell #4	66
G	Survey Questionnaire and Frequency of Response for Cell #5	70
H	Survey Questionnaire and Frequency of Response for Cell #6	74

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE	TABLE	
4	1	Total Population Size for the Six Groups of the Design
10	2	Sample Sizes for the Design
14	3	Return Rate of the Questionnaire
16	4	Grade Level(s) of BAWP Program Teachers
18	5	Average Number of Years Participants had Taught when Taking Part in BAWP Programs
19	6	Percentage of People Indicating that Receiving University Credit is of Some Importance
20	7	Percentage of People Indicating that Receiving District Credit is of Some Importance
22	8	Percentage of Respondents Attending 75% or More of the BAWP Program Meetings
24	9	Percentage of Teachers Noting Increase in Students' Valuing, Enjoyment, Confidence and Skill in Writing
26	10	Percentage of Teachers Noting Increase in Their Own Ability, Efficiency, Confidence and Skill in Teaching Writing
28	11	Percentage of Teachers Noting Increase in Their Own Collaborative Activities, Programmatic Change Activities, and Professional Activities
30	12	Number of BAWP Participants Having Subsequent Involvement with BAWP
32	13	Percentage of Respondents Scoring "4" or "5" (Moderately Great to Great Use) to Question of Overall Usefulness of BAWP
33	14	Mean Scores of BAWP Program Participants to Question of Overall Usefulness of BAWP
38	15	Frequencies and Mean Scores for Perceived Support/Opposition from School District

PAGE	FIGURE	
9	1	Six Cells of the Study's Design

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY

In order to better understand the impact of the BAWP program, past participants from four types of BAWP experiences (elementary inservice, secondary inservice, University Extension courses and Summer Invitational programs) were surveyed regarding their reactions to the program. Specifically, two major questions are addressed by this study.

1) Overall, what have been the long term effects of BAWP on teachers?

2) Are there any differences in impact and effectiveness of BAWP according to which of the types of programs an individual has experienced?

In addition, we hoped to gain a better sense of the history and development of the BAWP program by exploring the perceptions of participants from its early years.

POPULATIONS TO BE SURVEYED

BAWP reaches teachers in a variety of ways. BAWP ideas are first defined, selected and exchanged by a small group of teachers in Summer Invitational Programs. A selected group of teachers become consultants, training other teachers at school based inservice programs. The inservice component provides a "multiplier" effect for BAWP ideas and techniques.

The BAWP "model" of inservice has evolved through several stages. The early inservices were presented by a few teachers and a university instructor who became the director and staff of the new writing project. One district which hosted those early presentations has provided much information about the inception of BAWP inservice programs.

During the first years of inservices, 1974 and 1975, preliminary workshops of 1-2 sessions, generally focusing on questions raised by teachers, led to more extended offerings. During the more extended inservicing, the BAWP director (who also served as the inservice coordinator) generally took other teachers to give presentations of their own successful teaching practices. The early inservices, like the later ones, included writing-editing groups as a vital element of the experience. Thus, a precedent was set for the later, more "standardized" inservice offerings.

We encountered several difficulties locating all the members of the population we should sample for a description of the long term impact of BAWP. The early years of BAWP development did not rigidly follow a "model" of inservice. Maintaining flexibility in adapting to a district's needs or wants may have been important in BAWP's early stages, however that flexibility, together with rapid expansion and understaffing also meant that few records were kept for those early years of inservice enrollment. Where university credit or district credit was offered our efforts were greatly assisted, but in general, identities were not easily recovered.

A list was compiled of inservice participants in the various programs for 1974 and 1975, but since many of the early BAWP workshops were not a full 8-10 sessions (or 30 hours) they were not included in this survey. Further, those early workshops were frequently needs assessment and/or planning oriented discussions --- "What do we need?" --- rather than presentations of promising practices, and so differed significantly from the most recent and fairly standardized inservices.

As BAWP generated a pool of teacher consultants trained in the summer programs to appear at inservice meetings, the inservice program began to take on a more standardized format. The current full-scale

inservice includes 10-12 sessions (generally about 30 hours of exposure) coordinated by a teacher consultant, preferably from the local district. Different BAWP teacher consultants speak at each session. Writing-editing groups meet apart from the speaker sessions. Only such full-scale inservices are included in this report to make comparisons across groups and years more reliable.

Many schools or districts included in the present study also participated in the earliest years of BAWP and pre-BAWP workshops. We cannot know for these districts, how important these earlier years were or how these districts differ from others with less exposure. This multiple BAWP exposure also may have clouded participants' recollections of each year's particular experiences.

A fairly complete list of inservice participants for the years 1975-1978 was compiled by assimilating records kept by the BAWP central staff, the various district offices and often by contacting the inservice coordinator or an inservice participant. Names of extension students were readily available and were included in the population to be sampled. All participants of the Summer Invitational Programs, 1974-1978 were surveyed. Table 1 shows the population sizes which could be defined for each of the 4 types of BAWP experiences.

---

insert table 1 about here

DESCRIPTION OF THE FOUR BAWP PROGRAMS SURVEYED

Each summer approximately twenty-five experienced and talented teachers of writing, drawn from the nine counties of the San Francisco Bay Area and representing every level of instruction, pre-school through university, are invited to participate in the Bay Area Writing Project as University of California Summer Fellows. Participants receive a stipend of $500 to cover

Table 1
Total Population Size for the Six Groups of the Design

Cell #1 Elementary Participants	YEAR	PARTICIPANTS
Ross Elementary School District	1975-76	19
Moraga School District	1975-76	12
Moraga School District	1976-77	8
Dixie Elementary School District	1976-77	8
San Ramon School District	1976-77	24
Mill Valley School District	1975-76 1976-77	17
		88
Cell #2 Secondary Participants	**1975-76**	
Merced School District		37
Modesto School District		47
Santa Rosa School District		10
		94
Cell #3 Secondary Participants	**1976-77**	
Santa Rosa School District		10
Lodi School District		34
San Jose School District		24
Fremont Unified School District		23
		91
Cell #4 Secondary Participants	**1977-78**	
Albany Unified School District		39
Berkeley School District		20
Castro Valley School District		55
Fremont Elementary		11
Fremont Secondary		18
Fremont Union School District/ Sunnyvale Elementary		38
Hayward School District		18
Jefferson School District		9
Marin County Teacher Cooperative		35

Table 1 cont.

Mt. View/Los Altos School District	34
Oakdale School District	25
Oakland School District	12
San Leandro School District	22
San Mateo School District	4
Santa Rosa School District	18
Shoreline School District	18
St. Helena School District	20
Union City School District	24
Visalia School District	20
Yerba Buena School District	18
	458*

Cell #5 University Extension Participants

The Writing Student and the Writing Teacher	Feb.-April 1977	23
Composition: Vision and Revision	Sept.-Dec. 1977	13
Classroom Tested Writing Activities for the Junior High/Middle School	March 1978	32
See Dick and Jane Write: Teaching Writing K-8	August 1977	57
Writing Across the Curriculum	August 1978	55
		180

Cell #6 Summer Invitational Participants

1974-1978 inclusive	131

* This number is larger than the actual cell size used for sampling. The number of participants on which the sample size was based (n=390) came from the 1977-1978 inservice report, and reflected only those individuals reported to have received district credit for their participation --- in that way a more full exposure to the BAWP program was assured.

registration fees and expenses, and earn nine quarter units of university credit. The teachers are invited on the basis of recommendation, reputation for quality of teaching, and personal interview.

The Summer Fellows meet all day, four days a week, for five weeks. They examine problems in the teaching of writing, present and demonstrate teaching approaches, study current and past research in the field, and write compositions in various modes and from different points of view. They also write a position paper on their beliefs about the teaching of writing at the end of the summer experience.

Selected Summer Fellows become Teacher Consultants of the Bay Area Writing Project and may be called on during the regular school year as paid consultants for school district inservice programs.

School District Inservice Projects

Schools or districts wishing to improve writing instruction through inservice training can arrange for the Bay Area Writing Project to design and coordinate special training programs for their faculties. These programs take various forms depending on the particular needs of a district. The typical full-scale program involves about ten three-hour sessions conducted every other week by Teacher Consultants trained in the Summer Institutes and coordinated by BAWP staff. A full range of specific approaches to the teaching of composition is introduced and the teachers themselves write as if they were students receiving the instruction. Most such inservices also provide time for peer editing groups where teachers share their own original compositions.

School district inservices can be shaped to meet the needs of audiences at different grade levels, as the various BAWP Teacher Consultants come from every level of instruction, pre-school through

university. For this reason, districts wishing to train teachers K-6 can request approaches applicable to that level while districts wishing a more general K-12 approach can request a wider range of presentations. Districts or schools finance this training which is offered at no cost to the teacher. The teachers, however, are rarely paid or given release time to attend. [1]

University Extension Courses

Two types of courses are offered through BAWP and the University of California Extension. One type gives credit at a reduced rate for individuals taking inservice through BAWP in their own school. That type has been referred to as elementary and secondary regular inservice in this report. The second type of extension course is offered as a university extension regular course and is listed in the extension course catalogue. BAWP Teacher Consultants teach these latter courses which many teachers enroll in at their own expense. As university extension courses, they are open to the general public, and are not limited to English teachers or, indeed, to teachers at all.

These courses tend to focus on particular areas of interest rather than presenting a potpourri of ideas like the regular inservice or Summer Invitational programs. Course title of university extension courses taught by the BAWP Teacher Consultants include the following:

Approaches to Writing: Teachers on Teaching
Classroom Tested Writing Activities for Junior High/ Middle School Students
See Dick and Jane Write: Teaching Writing K-8
The Writing Student and the Writing Teacher
Writing Across the Curriculum K-12
Composition: Vision and Revision

[1]Coordination with UC Education Extension enables all participants to receive U.C. credit for participation in BAWP inservice training. The fee charged to inservice participants is at a substantially reduced rate as compared to "regular" extension offerings (see Cost Report, School Year Inservice Component, for a more complete discussion of these arrangements).

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Sample

The four types of BAWP program experiences were grouped into six cells for the purposes of selecting samples and analyzing results. Figure 1 shows the composition of the six cells.

---

insert figure 1 about here

Samples were drawn from cells 1 through 5; the school year programs. It was also decided to survey the most intense of the Summer programs, the Summer Invitational. All Summer Invitational participants were surveyed, representing years 1974-1978. For logistic reasons, the less intense Summer programs, Subject A and Summer Open Session, were not surveyed.

The total sample size for cells 1 to 5 was set at one-third of the total population size for those cells. Thus, a total of 277 (one-third of 843, the population size) teachers were selected to be surveyed. A proportional sampling strategy was used to identify the numbers within each cell to be surveyed. That is, the sample size for each cell is the same proportion of 277 as is the actual cell size of the total population size (843). Table 2 presents sample sizes for each of the cells. In all cases, at least one individual from each district was included in the survey.

---

insert table 2 about here

Figure 1
Six Cells of the Study's Design

ELEMENTARY EMPHASIS INSERVICE	SECONDARY EMPHASIS INSERVICE 1975-1976	SECONDARY EMPHASIS INSERVICE 1976-1977	SECONDARY EMPHASIS INSERVICE 1977-1978	UNIVERSITY EXTENSION "REGULAR" OFFERINGS	SUMMER INVITATIONAL PROGRAM

Table 2
Sample Sizes for the Design

Selected sample size for proportional sampling		277
Cell one sample	10.4% x 277	29
Cell two sample	11.2% x 277	31
Cell three sample	10.8% x 277	30
Cell four sample	46.2% x 277	128
Cell five sample	21.4% x 277	59
		277
All cell six participants sampled		131
Number of participants needed for proportional sampling		408*

*Actual number of questionnaires sent out to participants slightly larger than this number due to problems in locating some individuals (If a questionnaire was undeliverable, another was sent to an alternate participant.)

Assignment to Cells

In assigning individuals to cells, we determined their participation in a particular year or type of program from district records rather than from personal accounts. Although some records may have been in error, we considered these more reliable than individual memory, especially since individuals who attended the same inservice often disagreed on when it had occured.

When a teacher participated in more than one category of BAWP training we assigned that person to the cell which represented the most intense or most recent experience using the following priority order:

1. Summer Invitational
2. Inservice most recently enrolled in
3. University Extension course most recently enrolled in

This method, of course, does not allow us to distinguish individuals who have had only one BAWP experience from individuals with multiple exposure. Moreover, some elementary teachers attended inservices designed primarily for secondary teachers, rather than attending purely elementary inservices. These teachers have been included in the sample of participants in secondary-emphasis inservices regardless of their teaching level.

Nature of the Questionnaire

The teacher attitude questionnaire used in this survey examines five major aspects of the teacher, his/her environment, and the BAWP experience. Those five areas of assessment are:

1. Demographic characteristics of the teacher. These include the teachers' types of class loads, the number of students taught per day, the number of writing students taught per day, the number of years the teacher has taught and the grade level(s) the teacher teaches.

2. Assessment of perceived impact of the inservice. Teachers were asked to rate the impact of the BAWP program on self and subsequent impact on students. In addition, teachers indicated any increases in their professional activities brought about by the BAWP experience.

3. Support/Opposition of the school environment. A direct question probed whether the teacher met with opposition, neutrality or support from the school environment after the inservice training.

4. Overall assessment of the value of BAWP training.

5. Assessment of specific skills, techniques and theoretical predispositions assimilated during the BAWP experience and implemented in the classroom. A list of 31 most commonly used techniques and strategies in BAWP training were presented and teachers indicated which ones they are using in their classrooms as a result of BAWP.

The questionnaire was designed to condense maximum information into minimum response time, out of consideration for busy teachers nearing the end of their school year.

Administration of the Questionnaire

A total of 416 individuals were sent questionnaires coded to allow checks on rate of return. Once the questionnaire was returned and sorted by cell, the code label was removed to assure anonymity. Teachers who did not return the questionnaire were reached by telephone after two weeks. Generally, the call prompted individuals to return the questionnaire. Three individuals preferred to complete the questionnaire by telephone interview.

Occasionally selected teachers had either left teaching or moved to other schools. Where possible those individuals were traced. University Extension participants' questionnaires were sent to the home rather than to a school address, unlike other cells. If addresses or phones had changed it was not possible to locate those individuals.

Table 3 shows the return rate of questionnaire by cell. We achieved

an overall return rate of 83%. Only cell #5, University Extension, had a return rate of less than 75%.

---

insert table 3 about here

RESULTS

The results obtained from this questionnaire survey have been analyzed in several different ways in an attempt to answer the two main questions of this study:

1. What have been the long term effects of BAWP on teachers?
2. Are there any differences in impact and effectiveness of BAWP according to which type of BAWP program an individual experiences?

The following analyses were examined:

1. Frequencies of response across all questions for all cells combined. (see Appendix A)
2. Frequencies of response across all questions for each cell of the design, separately tabulated. (available upon request)
3. Frequencies of response across all questions analyzed by year of participation for all cells of the design combined. (available upon request)
4. Frequencies of response across all questions analyzed by year of participation for each type of BAWP program (elementary emphasis, secondary emphasis, extension courses, Summer Invitational). (available upon request)

With respect to analyses by year, it is important to note that no strong conclusions can be drawn from the 1974 inservice responses, because of the difficulties in locating participants and the atypical program in those years, running anywhere from one to ten meetings. As a result, sample size for the year 1974 is especially small (n=5) when we exclude the eighteen 1974 Summer Invitational people. For this reason analyses of "trend" across years has been limited to the four year span 1975-1978. Though no participants were

Table 3
Return Rate of the Questionnaire

CELL	QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETED	RETURNED UNDELIVERABLE	REPORTED NEVER IN PROJECT	NO FORWARDING ADDRESS AVAILABLE FROM PAST SCHOOL	NOT ABLE TO CONTACT	ON LEAVE	CALLED, BUT NO RESPONSE	ADJUSTED RESPONSE RATE*
1 29 sent	25	2	1				1	$\frac{25}{26}$ = 96%
2 33 sent	19	2	1	5			6	$\frac{19}{25}$ = 83%
3 31 sent	21			3	2	1	4	$\frac{21}{28}$ = 75%
4 132 sent	99	1	5	5	13	1	8	$\frac{99}{121}$ = 82%
5 60 sent	32	9	2		14		3	$\frac{32}{49}$ = 65%
6 131 sent	106	8	2	4	3	3	5	$\frac{106}{117}$ = 91%
TOTALS 416 sent	302	22	11	17	32	5		$\frac{302}{366}$ = 83% return

* Adjusted Response Rate = total number of questionnaires sent out
minus "returned undelivered"
minus "reported never in project"
minus "no forwarding address"

as denominator to "questionnaire completed" frequency

drawn from the 1978-1979 school year inservice programs, some individuals indicated that school year as their year of participation in the BAWP program. Perhaps those individuals had multiple exposure to the BAWP program (we know this to be true in some instances) and in self-selecting the year of participation chose the most recent year. For that reason we should use care in the manner in which we make interpretations.

Demographic Characteristics of BAWP Participants

Over the years of BAWP programs, the population it reaches has changed slightly. Most obvious is the sharp increase of elementary teachers in BAWP programs. Table 4 reveals that until 1976 only about 5% of BAWP participants taught at the elementary level, but in the 1976-1977 school year that proportion rose to over 20% and has continued to grow in subsequent years. All levels of instruction are almost equally represented in the 1977 and 1978 programs.

---

insert table 4 about here

Table 5 shows that current BAWP participants have taught on the average, approximately 12 years rather than 18 or more as was the case at BAWP's inception, suggesting that BAWP has increased the proportion of less experienced to veteran teachers in the program offerings. Summer Invitational participants generally included those teachers with the most teaching experience, while the University Extension participants' average number of years teaching is the lowest of the groups surveyed.

Table 4
Grade Level(s) of BAWP Program Teachers

	k-6	7-8	9-12	13+
1974	5%	5%	82%	8%
1975	6%	19%	69%	6%
1976	21%	27%	46%	6%
1977	28%	15%	53%	4%
1978	31%	18%	43%	8%

---

insert table 5 about here

In terms of reasons for participating in BAWP, only the University Extension enrollees indicated that receiving university credit was an important reason for seeking inservice training. Other groups, with the exception of the Summer Invitational fellows, have indicated that receiving district credit, usually associated with salary raises, was an important factor in deciding to participate, especially in recent years when the practice of offering credit/salary incentives has been more widespread. Tables 6 and 7 list the percentages of individuals in each cell who reported that receiving university or district credit was of at least some importance.

---

insert tables 6 and 7 about here

Attendance

Table 8 shows the percentages of individuals who attended 75% or more of the inservice meetings. Elementary emphasis inservices show the lowest proportion of participants who report attending more than 75% of the meetings, with attendance falling off in 1977-1978. Participants in the 1976 secondary emphasis inservices have the second lowest proportion of high attenders. Individuals enrolled in the other years of secondary inservice, as well as in University Extension courses and the Summer Invitational program indicate attendance at more than 75% of the meetings. Overall, 89% (n=267) of the teachers indicated attending at least three-fourths of the BAWP meetings.

Table 5

Average Number of Years Participants had Taught
When Taking Part in BAWP Program

	Cell 1	Cell 2-4	Cell 5	Cell 6	
	Elementary Emphasis Inservice	Secondary Emphasis Inservice	University Extension	Summer Invitational	Overall
1974	---	16 yrs	---	18 yrs	18 yrs
1975	20+ yrs	15.3 yrs	13 yrs	15.3 yrs	15.5 yrs
1976	14.5 yrs	13 yrs	11.5 yrs	13 yrs	13 yrs
1977	18 yrs	12.8 yrs	9.3 yrs	14 yrs	12.8 yrs
1978	13 yrs	11.5 yrs	10.3 yrs	13.5 yrs	12.3 yrs

Table 6

Percentage of People Indicating That Receiving University Credit Is of Some Importance

	Cell 1 Elementary Emphasis Inservice	Cell 2-4 Secondary Emphasis Inservice	Cell 5 University Extension	Cell 6 Summer Invitational	Overall
1974	---	100% (4)	---	7% (14)	33% (18)
1975	0% (2)*	30% (10)	---	12% (17)	20% (30)
1976	44% (9)	23% (13)	50% (2)	10% (21)	22% (45)
1977	0% (4)	34% (73)	67% (12)	20% (20)	43% (109)
1978	0% (1)	37% (16)	44% (9)	5% (21)	23% (47)

* () = sample size

Table 7

Percentage of People Indicating That Receiving District Credit Is of Some Importance

	Cell 1 Elementary Emphasis Inservice	Cell 2-4 Secondary Emphasis Inservice	Cell 5 University Extension	Cell 6 Summer Invitational	Overall
1974	---	100% (3)	---	31% (16)	42% (19)
1975	0% (2)*	56 (9)	---	18 (17)	28 (29)
1976	44 (9)	15 (13)	0% (2)	21 (19)	23 (43)
1977	0 (3)	33 (47)	73 (11)	32 (19)	36 (100)
1978	50 (2)	40 (15)	67 (9)	5 (21)	30 (47)

* () = sample size

---

insert table 8 about here

Impact on Students

A majority of teachers (in most cases more than 75%) see the BAWP experience as having increased their students' enjoyment of writing, valuing of writing, confidence in their writing ability and overall skill in writing ability. As noted in Table 9, the elementary inservice participants for years 1975, 1976 and 1977 all note increase in their students' valuing of writing and confidence in their writing. Secondary emphasis participants note an increase in students' confidence in writing and in students' overall skill, although percentages of teachers who gave top ratings for increases in these areas fluctuates somewhat from year to year, with teachers 1976-1978 making more qualified judgements than the total enthusiasm expressed in 1974 and 1975. More 1977 extension participants believe students' attitudes and writing skills have improved as a result of their extension training than do 1978 extension participants, who seem less enthusiastic about their experience generally. Invitational participants show no significant differences in assessment of student attitudes and skills across years of their own participation in BAWP with the exception of the 1975 participants' lower assessments of students' valuing of writing and enjoyment of writing. As noted in other assessments of the Summer Invitational program, the 1975 invitational was not as well received as had been the 1974 program. The lower assessments of BAWP by that group on several questions across the survey questionnaire are consistent

Table 8
Percentage of Respondents Attending 75% or More
of the BAWP Program Meetings

	Cell 1 Elementary Emphasis Inservice	Cell 2-4 Secondary Emphasis Inservice	Cell 5 University Extension	Cell 6 Summer Invitational	Overall
1974	---	100%(5)	---	100%(17)	100%(2)
1975	100%(2)*	100 (11)	---	100 (18)	100 (32)
1976	82 (11)	74 (19)	100%(3)	95 (22)	85 (55)
1977	60 (5)	91 (79)	92 (12)	100 (23)	92 (119)
1978	67 (3)	94 (18)	100 (11)	100 (21)	96 (53)

* () = sample size

with observer's reports of the group's lower level of enthusiasm during the BAWP summer program. Although there were fluctuations by year and by type of BAWP exposure, these results show that overall, most teachers believe their BAWP experience has had an impact on student writing.

---

insert table 9 about here

Impact on Teachers

A majority of teachers (in most cases more than 75%) see the BAWP experience as having increased their ability to relate theory to practice in the teaching of writing, their efficiency as a writer, their confidence in teaching writing and their level of skill in teaching writing. As shown in Table 10, elementary emphasis participants show a fluctuation in assessment on all of these dimensions when compared across years of participation. The small sample sizes across years tend to amplify whatever individual differences exist, and should be taken into account in interpreting these data. The secondary emphasis participants also fluctuate across years in proportions who rate BAWP as having a positive impact on their writing and teaching skills. Between 1975 and 1976 there is a drop in positive ratings of BAWP's effect on: 1)ability to relate theory to practice, 2)efficiency as a writer, and 3)level of skill in teaching writing. This difference may reflect the great expansion of the inservice component during the 1976 school year. In addition, unidentified factors influencing teacher morale in the public schools, and/or factors in the way BAWP was introduced into districts and schools may contribute to this drop in proportion of enthusiastic ratings, which is reflected in responses

Table 9
Percentage of Teachers Noting Increase in Students' Valuing, Enjoyment, Confidence and Skill in Writing

	Cell 1 Elementary Emphasis Inservice	Cell 2-4 Secondary Emphasis Inservice	Cell 5 University Extension	Cell 6 Summer Invitational	Overall
Students' Valuing of Writing					
1974	---	80%(5)	---	100%(13)	94%(18)
1975	100%(2)*	86 (7)	---	73 (15)	79 (24)
1976	100 (5)	69 (13)	100%(1)	83 (18)	81 (37)
1977	100 (2)	63 (63)	78 (9)	86 (21)	71 (95)
1978	50 (2)	73 (11)	50 (6)	94 (16)	77 (35)
Students' Enjoyment of Writing					
1974	---	60%(5)	---	85%(13)	78%(18)
1975	100%(2)	83 (6)	---	67 (15)	74 (23)
1976	67 (6)	64 (14)	0%(1)	67 (21)	64 (42)
1977	100 (3)	64 (64)	90 (10)	80 (20)	71 (97)
1978	100 (2)	75 (12)	60 (5)	95 (16)	83 (35)
Students' Confidence in Their Writing Ability					
1974	---	100%(4)	---	92%(13)	94%(17)
1975	100%(2)	100 (7)	---	88 (16)	92 (25)
1976	100 (5)	85 (13)	100%(1)	90 (20)	90 (39)
1977	100 (3)	75 (69)	90 (10)	86 (21)	80 (103)
1978	---	73 (15)	75 (4)	93 (15)	82 (34)
Student's Overall Writing Skill					
1974	---	100%(4)	---	100%(13)	100%(17)
1975	---	100 (6)	---	93 (15)	95 (21)
1976	83%(6)	92 (13)	0%(0)	95 (19)	92 (38)
1977	100 (3)	81 (62)	90 (10)	89 (18)	84 (93)
1978	---	83 (12)	50 (4)	94 (16)	84 (32)

* ()= sample size

to other items on the survey questionnaire as well.[2]

---

insert table 10 about here

In general, a majority of teachers (in most cases more than 75%), see the BAWP experience as increasing the frequency of their discussions with fellow teachers, but only some groups in some years report increases in collaborative activities, in program change activities or in subsequent professional activities in the teaching field as a result of BAWP. For the inservice groups and the University Extension group, it seems that a major effect of BAWP has been to increase the amount of discussion with other teachers. However, much lower proportions of teachers report that the BAWP experience has much impact on increasing collaborative activities such as team teaching or on increasing professional activities such as giving presentations at inservices or helping to plan and/or revise whole programs. The only group which shows large increases on dimensions of giving presentations at inservices, planning or coordinating inservice programs, taking a leadership role in the planning or school writing programs and taking a leadership role in the planning of English proficiency standards, is the Summer Invitational group. This might be expected, as it is the only group specifically selected and channeled toward positions of leadership as inservice coordinators and planners. Table 11 reveals these dramatic differences between the Summer Invitational participants and all other program participants. No great differences exist in this area between teachers participating in different years of the Summer Invitational with the exception that, again, the 1975 participants report the lowest

[2]Director James Gray also notes that the 1975 Summer Invitational had problems of morale and cohesion leading to a low percentage of active teacher consultants from that year. This lower sense of morale may have been communicated in inservice offerings the following school year.

Table 10
Percentage of Teachers Noting Increase in Their Own Ability, Efficiency, Confidence and Skill in Teaching Writing

	Cell 1	Cell 2-4	Cell 5	Cell 6	
	Elementary Emphasis Inservice	Secondary Emphasis Inservice	University Extension	Summer Invitational	Overall
Your Ability to Relate Practices in Teaching Writing					
1974	---	100%(5)	---	89%(18)	91%(23)
1975	100%(2)*	100 (8)	---	82 (17)	89 (27)
1976	56 (9)	67 (18)	100%(3)	91 (22)	77 (52)
1977	100 (4)	76 (70)	75 (8)	91 (23)	80 (105)
1978	67 (3)	87 (15)	43 (7)	95 (21)	83 (46)
Your Efficiency as a Writer					
1974	---	80%(5)	---	53%(17)	59%(22)
1975	50%(2)	29 (7)	---	41 (17)	41 (27)
1976	36 (11)	50 (16)	67%(3)	75 (20)	58 (50)
1977	100 (3)	60 (72)	60 (10)	74 (23)	64 (108)
1978	33 (3)	75 (16)	25 (8)	85 (20)	68 (47)
Your Confidence in Teaching Writing					
1974	---	80%(5)	---	88%(17)	86%(22)
1975	100%(1)	100 (7)	---	89 (18)	92 (26)
1976	90 (10)	88 (17)	100%(3)	95 (22)	92 (52)
1977	100 (4)	79 (73)	91 (11)	87 (23)	83 (111)
1978	67 (13)	88 (17)	57 (7)	100 (21)	88 (48)
Your Level of Skill in Teaching Writing					
1974	---	100%(5)	---	94%(17)	95%(22)
1975	---	100 (7)	---	94 (18)	96 (25)
1976	78%(9)	88 (16)	100%(2)	90 (21)	88 (48)
1977	100 (2)	84 (64)	100 (11)	95 (22)	89 (99)
1978	67 (3)	87 (15)	20 (5)	100 (20)	84 (43)

* () = sample size

ratings compared to the other years.

---

insert table 11 about here

Those individuals taking part in inservice programs and University Extension courses report little subsequent involvement with BAWP, while the Summer Invitational participants almost unanimously report further involvement.[3] This reflects the intent, again, of the summer program which is to train teacher consultants who will continue to "spread the word of BAWP" through inservices and other programs. Table 12 shows that 15 individuals (7.5%) from groups 1-5 indicate subsequent involvement with BAWP, while all but 6 of the Summer Invitational people report further involvement with the writing project. Several aneddotal comments made by the respondents in groups 1-5 indicated that further involvement with the writing project was often not class or inservice oriented, but rather focused on; providing intra-district inservices stemming from the BAWP experience, working on school program writing assessments, and on urging other districts and/or schools to use the BAWP series as staff development.

---

insert table 12 about here

Overall Assessment of BAWP

Regarding overall assessment of the BAWP program, the vast majority (over 90%) report that the BAWP experience was of use to them. Table 13 shows the percentages of respondents indicating a score of "4" or "5" on a 1 (of little use) to 5 (a great deal of use) scale, in response to the following question:

[3]This is to be expected, as currently inservice participants receive no notification of other BAWP-sponsored programs except through informal correspondence with teacher consultants.

Table 11
Percentage of Teachers Noting Increase in Their Own Collaborative Activities, Programmatic Change Activities, and Professional Activities

	Cell 1	Cell 2-4	Cell 5	Cell 6	
	Elementary Emphasis Inservice	Secondary Emphasis Inservice	University Extension	Summer Invitational	Overall
Discussions with Fellow Teachers on the Teaching of Writing					
1974	---	100%(5)	---	89%(18)	91%(23)
1975	100%(2)*	60 (10)	---	83 (18)	77 (30)
1976	64 (11)	67 (18)	50%(2)	86 (21)	73 (52)
1977	75 (4)	64 (76)	50 (12)	87 (23)	68 (115)
1978	100 (3)	88 (17)	0 (7)	95 (21)	79 (48)
Collaborative Activities with Other Teachers					
1974	---	80%(5)	---	61%(18)	65%(23)
1975	0%(2)	40 (10)	---	22 (18)	27 (30)
1976	30 (10)	18 (17)	0%(1)	52 (21)	35 (49)
1977	33 (3)	24 (72)	50 (12)	70 (23)	36 (110)
1978	0 (2)	47 (17)	0 (6)	56 (18)	42 (43)
Taking a Leadership Role in the Planning of School Site or District Writing Programs					
1974	---	40%(5)	---	61%(10)	57%(23)
1975	50%(2)	40 (10)	---	61 (18)	53 (30)
1976	20 (10)	18 (17)	50%(2)	57 (21)	36 (50)
1977	0 (3)	26 (73)	33 (12)	65 (23)	34 (111)
1978	0 (3)	35 (17)	0 (6)	72 (18)	43 (44)

* () = sample size

Table 11 cont.

	Cell 1	Cell 2-4	Cell 5	Cell 6	
	Elementary Emphasis Inservice	Secondary Emphasis Inservice	University Extension	Summer Invitational	Overall
Taking a Leadership Role in the Planning of English Proficiency Standards					
1974	---	40%(5)	---	50%(16)	48%(21)
1975	100%(2)*	30 (10)	---	59 (17)	52 (29)
1976	10 (10)	25 (16)	100%(2)	47 (19)	34 (47)
1977	0 (3)	31 (74)	33 (12)	52 (21)	35 (110)
1978	0 (2)	35 (17)	0 (6)	47 (19)	34 (44)
Giving Presentations at Inservice or Professional Meetings					
1974	---	0%(5)	---	67%(18)	52%(23)
1975	0% (2)	20 (10)	---	78 (18)	53 (30)
1976	18 (11)	12 (17)	50%(2)	77 (22)	42 (52)
1977	33 (3)	18 (73)	33 (12)	68 (22)	30 (110)
1978	0 (3)	41 (17)	0 (6)	90 (20)	54 (46)
Organizing or Coordinating an Inservice Program					
1974	---	20%(5)	---	67%(18)	57%(23)
1975	50%(2)	0 (10)	---	50 (18)	33 (30)
1976	18 (11)	12 (17)	50%(2)	62 (21)	35 (51)
1977	0 (3)	16 (73)	33 (12)	57 (21)	26 (109)
1978	0 (3)	18 (17)	0 (6)	68 (19)	36 (45)
Other Professional Activities Related to the Teaching of Writing					
1974	---	25%(4)	---	73%(11)	60%(15)
1975	100%(1)	33 (6)	---	50 (8)	47 (15)
1976	11 (9)	15 (13)	0%(1)	55 (11)	26 (34)
1977	33 (3)	13 (52)	33 (9)	65 (17)	27 (81)
1978	0 (2)	18 (11)	0 (7)	75 (12)	34 (32)

* () = sample size

Table 12
Number of BAWP Participants Having Subsequent Involvement with BAWP

What has been your subsequent involvement with BAWP activities?	Cell 1	Cell 2	Cell 3	Cell 4	Cell 5	Cell 6
None	14	15	17	71	24	6
BAWP open session summer participant	0	1	1	5	1	4
BAWP Summer Invitational Fellow	0	0	0	0	0	22
BAWP consultant	0	0	1	3	0	79
BAWP coordinator	1	0	2	0	0	35
SAMPLE SIZE	25	19	21	99	32	106

Now that you have had a chance to reflect, give an overall rating of the usefulness of the BAWP training in assisting you to become a better teacher of writing.

---

insert table 13 about here

Table 14 shows the mean scores of each of the 6 groups' responses to this same question. It is interesting to note that the vocal criticism indicating that BAWP does not totally meet the needs brought to inservice by elementary people, is somewhat substantiated in the elementary inservice overall assessment of BAWP effectiveness. These individuals, while positive in their rating, are among the lowest of the six groups surveyed. Comparison with elementary (K-8) teachers attending secondary-emphasis inservice reveals that those individuals rated the inservice more highly than any other single group ($\bar{X} = 4.13$; $n = 50$). While it was assumed that possibly this group of people might be those individuals least satisfied with the BAWP experience since their particular level of teaching was not being addressed directly, analysis revealed that assumption to be incorrect. In fact, it appears that elementary teachers attending inservices generally secondary in focus find a great deal of use with the material presented. This lends credence to the notion that building in a sense of articulation with teachers of the various grade levels is a productive endeavor, and one which is met positively by the participants involved.[4]

---

insert table 14 about here

It is also noteworthy that assessment of the inservice component shows a slight downward trend across the years 1975, 1976 and 1977, however that difference is small and may reflect issues other than decreasing pleasure with the BAWP program. In all cases, this assessment

[4]See Conclusion, p. 42 of this report for a more complete discussion of this point.

Table 13
Percentage of Respondents Scoring "4" or "5"
(Moderately great to Great Use) to Question of Overall Usefulness of BAWP

	Cell 1	Cell 2-4	Cell 5	Cell 6	
	Elementary Emphasis Inservice	Secondary Emphasis Inservice	University Extension	Summer Invitational	Overall
1974	---	100%	---	100%	100%
1975	100%	90	---	83	86
1976	50	58	100%	91	72
1977	75	69	91	87	75
1978	67	82	44	100	82

Table 14
Mean Scores of EAWP Program Participants to
Question of Overall Usefulness of EAWP

	Cell 1 Elementray Emphasis Inservice	Cell 2-4 Secondary Emphasis Inservice	Cell 5 University Extension	Cell 6 Summer Invitational
1974		$\bar{X}$= 4.6 (5)		$\bar{X}$= 4.9 (17)
1975	$\bar{X}$= 5.0 (1)*	4.6 (10)		4.2 (18)
1976	3.8 (10)	3.9 (19)	$\bar{X}$= 4.7 (3)	4.6 (22)
1977	4.3 (4)	4.0 (77)	4.5 (11)	4.6 (23)
1978	3.3 (3)	4.4 (17)	3.4 (9)	4.9 (21)
OVERALL	$\bar{X}$= 3.90 s= .97 n= 18	$\bar{X}$= 4.11 s= n= 128	$\bar{X}$= 4.04 s= 1.02 n= 23	$\bar{X}$= 4.65 s= .78 n= 101

* ()= sample size

reveals a sense of basic utility of the BAWP programs across all types of offerings. Out of 302 respondents to the survey questionnaire only 5 individuals indicated that their exposure to BAWP had been "of little use" (2 from secondary inservice, 1 from extension and 2 from Summer Invitational). The large majority of respondents providing additional comments indicated BAWP to be an "outstanding educational experience", a "stimulating course" and a "fantastic program". Clearly, regardless of type of BAWP program, teachers rate their experience as valuable. Moreover, even though many teachers do not have contact with BAWP once their inservice is over, the feelings about its worth do not diminish over time:

Impact on Teaching Practices

Question 9 lists 31 teaching techniques that might have been presented during BAWP training. Teachers were asked to rate each item according to a 4 point scale:

1 = Have never heard of
2 = Have heard of but do not use regularly
3 = Implemented (or revised) as a result of your BAWP experience and use regularly
4 = Use regularly, but not necessarily as a result of your BAWP experiences

These responses do not exhaust all the options. Some teachers may have implemented new strategies as a result of BAWP training, but may not have used them "regularly" yet. We cannot know how such teachers may have responded to this question.

Instances of assigning a #3, "implemented as a result of BAWP training", were tabulated for all practices for analyses. The practices most often appearing among the top ten in at least five groups with this #3 rating are as follows:

---increasing the number of different types of student writing (e.g. expressive, expository, practical, etc.)

---teaching writing as a process through prewriting activities

---teaching writing as a process through rewriting and revising

---use of peer response groups

---increasing the amount of in-class time devoted to writing

---increasing the number of in-class writing assignments

---increasing the number of audiences who read students work

---increasing the variety of writing topics

---increasing exploratory writing (free writing, journals)

The practices which received this rating most <u>infrequently</u> (appearing among the lowest ten in at least five groups included) are as follows:

---thesis formation

---dictation

---saturation reporting

---"right brain" activities (e.g. humanities, poetry)

---teacher-student writing conferences

---writing contracts

---individualized practice sheets

---increasing the number of homework assignments

Across all programs, the practices most often described as having been implemented or revised as a result of BAWP training reflect primarily BAWP emphases. Their appearance among the top ten "impact" practices suggests that for most participants these ideas presented a departure in some way from their previous practices.

The practices receiving the "impact" rating less frequently include several which BAWP spends time on, but which may not be new to teachers (e.g. thesis formation) or which may be limited in application to only a few age levels or types of classes (e.g. saturation reporting,

usually used in senior high; teacher-student writing conferences, usually only possible in a lab situation). Others may have suffered from ambiguity of phrasing: dictation (by whom and to whom?) and "right brain" activities, a term which many may not have positive or clear associations for. The number of homework assignments is unlikely to increase if the teacher interprets assignments to mean new writing topics or exercises, since BAWP encourages fewer assignments overall, with more opportunity to pre-write and re-draft, especially in class where peer response is used at several stages.

The most implemented practices tend to be general approaches to writing which can effect teaching at any grade level, and which tend to result in more opportunities to write (including work on several drafts of the same piece) without increasing the teacher's work by adding hours of reading and marking. The data suggest that this is the primary change BAWP contributes to writing in the classroom.

District Support

Question 14 on the questionnaire, which inquired about the support or opposition encountered by the teachers returning from BAWP training, received a wide diversity of comments. Not uncommonly, respondents specified two or more environments --- "district was great!-- high school slow" and "other BAWP participants have been extremely supportive. Teachers not involved with the program have been hesitant to join me in projects etc." --- which posed coding problems for computer analysis. In these cases, the most conservative response was chosen to be coded. Table 15 presents frequencies of each response option across each group in the design of this study as well as means for those frequencies.

insert table 15 about here

In all cases, even when computing the most conservative average, respondents indicated district or school support to be moderately supportive. Specific comments were made regarding interaction with administration as a key variable, not only for support, but for effecting change in school or district programs. Those comments are typified by the following:

> Administration should take BAWP inservice. They're supportive because its fashionable, not because they understand.[5]
>
> District supports their own old methods, with no objections to new things as long as old things get taught.
>
> Principal gave release time to revise curriculum. We are planning more reunions. The district financed the BAWP session I coordinated.

Open-Ended Comments

Many respondents added open-ended comments which could not be coded and analyzed via computer, but provided valuable information about the impact of BAWP and about their experiences in the program. A sample of representative comments follows.

As might be expected, these individuals taking time to write out comments reflected extreme reactions --- glowing praise of the worth and general applicability of the BAWP training, or distainful criticism reflecting aspects of the program which did not suit particular expectations. Some examples of the most frequently addressed topics follow.

Although BAWP currently has a policy not to provide inservice in any district unless the attendance is voluntary, we did pick up comments from participants which indicated this not always to be the case. Such

[5] Director James Gray notes that administrator perception of BAWP has changed in the past year. Gray feels that most administrators think highly of BAWP content and applicability.

insert table 15 about here

In all cases, even when computing the most conservative average, respondents indicated district or school support to be moderately supportive. Specific comments were made regarding interaction with administration as a key variable, not only for support, but for effecting change in school or district programs. Those comments are typified by the following:

> Administration should take BAWP inservice. They're supportive because its fashionable, not because they understand.[5]
>
> District supports their own old methods, with no objections to new things as long as old things get taught.
>
> Principal gave release time to revise curriculum. We are planning more reunions. The district financed the BAWP session I coordinated.

Open-Ended Comments

Many respondents added open-ended comments which could not be coded and analyzed via computer, but provided valuable information about the impact of BAWP and about their experiences in the program. A sample of representative comments follows.

As might be expected, these individuals taking time to write out comments reflected extreme reactions --- glowing praise of the worth and general applicability of the BAWP training, or distainful criticism reflecting aspects of the program which did not suit particular expectations. Some examples of the most frequently addressed topics follow.

Although BAWP currently has a policy not to provide inservice in any district unless the attendance is voluntary, we did pick up comments from participants which indicated this not always to be the case. Such

[5] Director James Gray notes that administrator perception of BAWP has changed in the past year. Gray feels that most administrators think highly of BAWP content and applicability.

Table 15
Frequencies and Mean Scores for Perceived Support/Opposition from School District

	Cell 1 Elementary Emphasis Inservice	Cell 2-4 Secondary Emphasis Inservice	Cell 5 University Extension	Cell 6 Summer Invitational	Overall
"1" Strong Opposition	0	4	0	4	8
"2"	2	6	2	4	15
"3" Neutral	5	46	8	25	84
"4"	4	31	4	31	70
"5" Strong Support	9	35	5	32	81
Blank	4	17	13	10	44
Mean Score	3.91	3.71	3.63	3.87	3.78
Sample Size	25	139	32	106	302

comments were typified by the following.

> I did not enroll. District forced all sixth grade teachers to attend.
>
> Was told to attend by principal.

In regard to impact on students, teacher comments were typified by the following:

> I have no means by which to assess the impact on students since I have students only 18 weeks at a time. The critical factor is the impact of the training on me and the resultant change in my attitude and approach. These factors have bolstered my confidence and made my program stronger --- thereby helping the students.
>
> After my BAWP training, I felt so competent that I volunteered to be the adviser for the school's literary magazine and I chose to remain the teacher of the creative writing elective. I won my words of praise for the creative writing class format, my teaching techniques and journals that the students kept.

Anecdotal comments frequently accompanied the question of overall assessment of the BAWP program. They generally indicated extreme pleasure with their BAWP program as typified by the following:

> The value of this program far exceeds that of any training received at any other time.
>
> BAWP is a sensational program, filling a tremendous void which exists in the teaching profession. I'd like to be able to repeat the introductory session for credit many times or perhaps participate in regular (monthly?) follow-up meetings where various guest speakers (ie. teachers) could share concrete material with us, answer questions, etc.
>
> I feel it is the most valuable experience I have had in inservice training workshops since I began teaching in 1950.

From administrators involved in the BAWP experience these comments emerged:

> I have appreciated the fact that the level of expertise of the teachers and educators asking for consultant services has risen. They know what to ask for.
>
> BAWP has provided personal and departmental benefits as well as a validity in the Board's eyes that allows for change.

Suggestions, endorsements and criticisms were many and diverse in nature. Suggestions generally focused either on specifics of the inservice itself or on other needs yet unaddressed by BAWP:

> Provide more access for teachers to attend the summer "invitational." (I for one would love to attend, but I wasn't invited !) to become consultants for BAWP. I've often wondered how they're selected.
>
> Although the presentations were very good, being an eighth grade teacher I would have appreciated more information that would have pertained more directly to junior high composition.
>
> Teachers presenting to teachers should be spread across the curriculum.

Endorsements were generally specific to individual presenters, indicating particular pleasure with the message presented:

> Of all the work I ever took in language skills, this has been the most influential. The Moffet series is my, and my students', favorite, and I have appreciated its developmental sequence. It is fun!
>
> We (I especially) as a department have incorporated much of the course into our approach to writing. Almost everyone reads themes aloud and critiques in small groups.
>
> Enjoyed Miles Myers "Community of Writing" presentation —— would like to implement.

Criticisms were extremely infrequent. Of all the anecdotal material provided by respondents, only two obviously negative comments were made illustrating potential problems of program management:

> Unfortunately the teacher coordinator of the BAWP program in our school was disliked by many members of the staff, so the enthusiasm for the project was lacking. There has been little follow-up on school-wide "write-ins" and the meetings were of very little value. However, the teachers are stressing writing more on the whole in their classroom curriculum.
>
> I did not really have a BAWP experience. Our district did its usual half-assed job of taking a good idea, using it only for its evaluative effects (where are we in writing?), then doing no follow-up or training other than that necessary to get a set of statistics on our kids.

The first criticism reflects the very important need for careful selection of the coordinator. This recommendation has been made in previous reports, and this comment may well have come from an individual also in the sample from which that earlier recommendation was made. The second criticism reflects the importance of district attitude toward effecting change in programs. While it may not be possible for BAWP to assess the district attitude or motivation for providing inservice, this may well be an important variable in terms of writing project success in any district.

CONCLUSION

With only few exceptions, this follow-up report shows that teachers are highly enthusiastic about the Bay Area Writing Project, and that they believe it to have an impact on their own teaching of writing and in most cases, believe it to have an impact on students' enjoyment and valuing of writing. It is important to note that this questionnaire and the reported results are surveys of teacher perceptions only. No in-class observation, or other more objective methods of evaluation have been undertaken. It has been shown elsewhere (see Fairfax evaluation of Expressive Writing in the School) that self-report vs. observer ratings can be highly discrepant.

These analyses have revealed that some years of each type of BAWP offering have been less enthusiastically met than others, but in general, the groups were not significantly different in their appraisal of the impact of BAWP. Moreover, the effects of BAWP do not seem to diminish over time even though many teachers do not have ongoing exposure to BAWP. Teachers from the early years are just as enthusiastic about the program as more recent teachers reached by BAWP.

A significant finding of this report stands in contradiction to an earlier finding of the 1977-1978 inservice report. Regarding inservices serving a wide range of grade levels, it was commented that, "mixing of grade levels is a practice that works well with the extremely able teachers in the Summer Institute, but may not carry over well to more typical teachers". In fact, as earlier stated, it was found that those elementary teachers attending secondary emphasis inservices rated their BAWP experience the most highly of any other single group.

Generally, this report suggests that BAWP participants are pleased to have had the training and find many of the BAWP techniques new and adaptable to their own classroom situation. Perhaps this is best reflected in a closing comment from one of the questionnaire respondents:

> BAWP has profoundly effected the Bay Area teaching of writing and continues to do so as more teachers are reached.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of a single questionnaire survey, it is difficult to make strong suggestions for change in a project viewed as positively as the Bay Area Writing Project. It is hoped, however, that this survey might prompt discussions among BAWP leaders about program alternatives and that the assessment of specific techniques most and least implemented might provide useful feedback about the effectiveness of certain topics. Two areas for future discussion among BAWP control staff emerge from this questionnaire, as a result of the statistical analyses and from anecdotal comments provided by respondents.

With few exceptions, BAWP inservice programs are viewed very positively. Teachers report an increase in their own effectiveness and note improvements in student enjoyment of writing and student skill in writing. However, teachers receiving inservice training and those attending University Extension do not report increases in their efforts to effect programatic change through increased collaboration with other teachers, involvement in program design or revision, or inservice leadership. Many of them do not indicate further involvement with BAWP after their training, despite the availability of programs such as the summer Open Program and U.C. Extension courses which could provide the further exposure to BAWP ideas and techniques desired by many. The impact of the less intense training (school year inservices and extension courses) seems to remain at the level of individual classrooms. School-wide or district-wide program change is found infrequently as a result of school year inservicing only. Whether this type of impact will result in long term improvement of student writing skills is unknown without detailed, longitudinal investigation of student performance (see Field Studies Report).

Thirty-three anecdotal comments from the respondents called for some kind of BAWP follow-up to the inservice to discuss new techniques, effectiveness of implemented techniques and problems encountered with new strategies (this is consistent with findings from the 1977-1978 Inservice Report, p. 27).

BAWP leaders are also eager to give repeated inservices and in fact encourage the possibility with local participating districts. Why then are there few repeated invitations to return to local districts and so little subsequent involvement by individual teachers? Could BAWP add some features to its present program offerings which might facilitate continuing involvement and greater program impact? Certainly funding has been a major obstacle to BAWP performing these kinds of services with the inservice groups, particularly in the wake of Proposition 13 cut-backs. Yet certain features which have not been explored by BAWP but have proven successful elsewhere (see Critical Competitors report) could be added to the program. These changes could include the following:

1) More extensive advertisement of BAWP program options.

It is not known from our questionnaires whether inservice individuals do not know about summer and U.C. Extension options or whether they are not enrolling for some other reasons. Further, BAWP may want to consider opening the Saturday meetings (now generally intended for Summer Invitational and Open participants) to inservice and U.C. Extension participants. In light of the BAWP intent to promote a community of concerned and active teachers dedicated to change, providing this forum of exchange for only a select group of individuals may be contraindicated. Because the interest in continuing contact is strong, greater publicity of these BAWP offerings might be advised for inservice participants.

2) More inservice and Invitational time spent on considering models of program change. If BAWP wishes to create a lasting impact on student writing skills, then it may need to "raise the consciousness" of its largest group of participants about how to collaborate effectively with other teachers and how to participate in program change. If BAWP spends most of its energy reaching teachers as individuals without creating in them the need to become "change agents" outside the classroom, it may unwittingly limit its potential effects. This seems particularly important in light of BAWP's lack of a specific package of techniques and its concern for effecting change in such elusive areas as conceptualization of writing processes.

3) Greater effort to reach and "educate" administrators concerning the need for continuing support of inservice goals once the inservice has ended as well as during the course of the inservice. Including administrators as participants in the training (as has sometimes occured) can bring greater awareness of BAWP program goals, but in itself does not seem sufficient to effect long-term change. It seems important to gain administrators' approval of ongoing opportunities for encouraging feedback and monitoring of classroom implementation efforts and/or support of writing program planning and change. Measures which might be discussed as part of the inservice package could include classroom exchanges among participating teachers, release time for program planning, school visits and consultation by Teacher Consultants or coordinators, and greater time allowed during the inservice sessions themselves for feedback and discussion of efforts to implement techniques or discuss program change (see Critical Competitors report for examples). An orientation workshop intended only for administrators might provide a support base for BAWP in many different districts.

It is important to note that approximately 25% of the respondents felt neither support nor opposition from administrators in efforts to implement changes in the teaching of writing, and 8% of the respondents indicated some form of opposition to their efforts. Thus, at least one-third of the participants might benefit from ongoing administrative collaboration and assistance. The 1978 RAND report on implementing and sustaining innovations in education makes the importance of this administrative support clear:

> Three elements of a school's organizational climate powerfully affected the project's implementation and continuation --- the quality of working relationships among teachers, the active support of principals, and the effectiveness of project directors. The contribution of the principal to both short- and long-run effects of innovations can hardly be overstated. The principal's unique contribution to implementation lies not in "how to do it" advice better offered by project directors, but in giving moral support to the staff and in creating an organizational climate that gives the project "legitimacy". The principal's support was also crucial for continuation. Teachers were unlikely to continue a full array of project methods without the sanction of their principal, even if the methods were successful and had been assimilated (p. viii).

In summary, participants are overwhelmingly satisfied with their experiences in the BAWP programs. No "drop-off" effects from the participants in the beginning years were noted. That is, early and recent teachers express equal enthusiasm and report comparable impact of the program on their teaching effectiveness and their students' writing skills. The data suggest, however, that the impact of BAWP is largely confined to the individual classroom. While affecting changes in the classroom is definitely a critical step in improving the teaching of writing, perhaps it is now appropriate for BAWP to

consider incorporating activities which would yield more widespread comprehensive programmatic change in the writing curriculum.

REFERENCE NOTES

Field Studies Report. 1979, by Susan Thomas and Catharine Keech. BAWP Evaluation Unit.

Inservice Report. 1978, by Nancy Roark. BAWP Evaluation Unit.

Rand Report: Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Volume VIII. 1978, by Paul Berman and Milbrey McLaughlin for the U.S. Office of Education.

APPENDIX A

4-79 Frequency of Response for All Types of BAWP Programs Combined

Survey of Past Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP) Participants

1. Type of participation (check one)
   - 38% (1) Summer Invitational Program
   - 43 (2) School district inservice (name district _____)
   - 16 (3) UC extension

2. Year of participation (check one)

School Year		Summer	
3%	(1) 1974-75	4.7%	(7) 1974
6	(2) 1975-76	4.3	(8) 1975
11	(3) 1976-77	7.3	(9) 1976
28.7	(4) 1977-78	10.7	(10) 1977
4.7	(5) 1978-79	13	(11) 1978
13	(6) don't remember	52	(12) don't remember

3. Length of BAWP training program (check one)
   - 3% (1) 1 or 2 days duration
   - 6.7 (2) 2-3 weeks duration (e.g. extension format)
   - 49.7 (3) 8-10 weeks duration
   - 33 (4) other; please describe
   - 7.7 (5) don't remember

4. What were the grade levels of the teachers represented in your training?
   - 33.3% (1) K-12
   - 4.7 (2) K-6
   - 10.3 (3) 7-12
   - 2 (4) 7-9
   - 11.3 (5) 9-12
   - 32.7 (6) other; please describe
   - 6 (7) don't know or don't remember

5. Approximately what percentage of the sessions did you attend?
   - 1.7% (1) less than 25%
   - 2 (2) 25-50%
   - 4.3 (3) 51-75%
   - 89 (4) more than 75%
   - 3 (5) don't remember

6. How important were each of the following reasons for your enrolling in the BAWP training program?

	Not Very Important 1	2	3	4	Very Important 5	Blank
a. to meet district or department requirements	65.3%	3%	5.3%	3%	5.3%	13%
b. to obtain district credit	50.7	8	9.3	7.3	10.7	14
c. to obtain university or college credit	48	7.7	11.7	6	9.3	17.3
d. to learn more about teaching writing in general	1	.7	4.7	14.3	73.3	6
e. to learn how to handle specific writing problems	3.7	1.7	13	15	53.7	13
f. other: please describe	Not Coded					

7. How would you rate your level of participation in the BAWP training? (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1	2	3	4	5	Blank
1%	.3%	7%	30.7%	56.3%	4.7%
Active Withdrawal		Passive Attendance		Enthusiastic Participation	

8. What has been your subsequent involvement with BAWP activities (check all that apply)
   - 49% (1) none
   - 39 (2) BAWP open session summer participant
   - 7.3 (3) BAWP summer invitational fellow
   - 27.7 (4) BAWP consultant
   - 12.7 (5) BAWP coordinator
   - Not Coded (6) other: please describe

9. Below are a list of techniques and strategies for teaching writing that might have been presented during your BAWP training. Please indicate in the space provided whether the item is one which you:

1 = Have never heard of
2 = Have heard of but do not use regularly
3 = Implemented (or revised) as a result of your BAWP experiences and use regularly
4 = Use regularly, but not necessarily as a result of your BAWP experiences

____ (1) BAWP stressed sentence writing activities (e.g. sentence combining, Jo Miles predication, etc.)
____ (2) thesis formation (e.g. Tandy's controversial theses, etc.)
____ (3) essay organization (e.g. coherence, focus, etc.)
____ (4) diction (e.g. showing not telling, etc.)
____ (5) increasing the number of different types of student writing (e.g. expressive, expository, practical, etc.)
____ (6) writing from different points of view
____ (7) writing in different voices
____ (8) using modeling or imitation of forms or styles
____ (9) dictation
____ (10) saturation reporting
____ (11) "right-brain" activities (e.g. humanities, poetry, etc.)
____ (12) teaching writing as a process through prewriting activities
____ (13) teaching writing as a process through rewriting and revising
____ (14) using writing sequences (e.g. specific to abstract; personal to public, etc.)
____ (15) use of peer feedback (writing-editing groups)
____ (16) teacher-student writing conferences
____ (17) holistic marking of student papers
____ (18) writing contracts
____ (19) individualized practice sheets
____ (20) increasing the amount of in class time devoted to writing
____ (21) increasing the number of in class writing assignments
____ (22) increasing the number of homework assignments
____ (23) writing along with student
____ (24) changing the relationship of writing to other language arts activities (e.g. reading, oral language)
____ (25) increasing number of audiences who read student work (e.g. other students, other adults, etc.)
____ (26) increasing amount of authentic written discourse (writing for real audiences)
____ (27) increasing variety of writing topics
____ (28) increasing exploratory writing (e.g. free writing, journal writing)
____ (29) increasing assignments suited to certain types of students (e.g. reluctant students, gifted students)
____ (30) increasing supportive, rewarding responses to students
____ (31) changing the grading strategies
____ (32) other (please describe)

See Appendix B for list of frequencies and item rankings for Question 9.

10. Please indicate the degree of impact that BAWP training has had, in general, on your students' attitudes and skills (explain your ratings if you wish):

	Greatly Decreased 1	2	No Change 3	4	Greatly Increased 5	Don't Know
a. students' valuing of writing	—	1.7%	15.7%	37.7%	17.7%	28.4%
b. students' enjoyment of writing	—	1.3	18	37.7	17.7	25.3
c. students' confidence in their writing ability	—	.7	11	47.7	16.3	24.3
d. students' overall writing skill	—	.7	7.7	45.7	15	31
e. other: please describe	Not Coded					

11. In your BAWP training program, how many of the following kinds of writing assignments did you do? (Circle one response for each type of assignment)

	Number of Assignments					
a. brief assignments (5-25 minutes during a training session)	0	1-3	4-6	7-9	10 or more	don't know/ don't remember
	2%	23%	28.3%	13.7%	12.7%	20.3%
b. longer assignments (over 30 minutes perhaps - completed at home)	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7 or more	don't know/ don't remember
	8%	31%	26.7%	17%	4%	13.3%

12. In the present school year, please estimate how many hours, on the average, you spend each week on the following activities:

	less than 1 hour	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	more than 9 hrs.	Blank
a. preparing curriculum materials	3%	13.7%	24%	14.7%	11.3	12.3	19%
b. writing along with students	44.7	24.3	10.7	1.3	.7	—	18.3
c. your own creative writing	45.3	17.7	6	4.7	1.7	4	20.7
d. grading student papers	4.3	4.3	10	17.7	18.7	25	20
e. conferencing with individual students (during and after class)	8.7	25.3	21	13	5.7	9.7	16.7

13. Please indicate the degree of impact you think the BAWP experience has had on:

	Greatly Decreased		No Change		Greatly Increased	Don't Know
	1	2	3	4	5	
a. your ability to relate practices in teaching writing to theories about teaching writing	.3%	.3%	14.7%	39%	33%	12.7%
b. your efficiency as a writer		1.7	32.7	41.7	10.7	13.3
c. your confidence in teaching writing	.7	.3	10.7	38	40	10.3
d. your level of skill in teaching writing	0	.7	5.7	41.3	31	18.3
e. other: please describe	Not Coded					

14. Please indicate overall the amount of support or opposition that you have encountered in the school or district environment in your attempts to implement changes in teaching writing. (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1	2	3	4	5	Blank
2.7%	5%	28%	23.3%	27%	14%
Strong Opposition		Neutral		Strong Support	

15. Please indicate to what extent the frequency of the following activities has changed due to your participation in the BAWP training program (and explain your ratings if you wish):

	Greatly Decreased		No Change		Greatly Increased	Don't Know
	1	2	3	4	5	
a. discussions with fellow teachers on the teaching of writing	.3%	1.3%	23%	42.3%	25.3%	7.7%
b. collaborative activities with other teachers (e.g. team teaching)	0	2	52.3	24.3	9.3	12
c. taking a leadership role in the planning of school site or district writing programs	.3	2.3	50.3	15.3	20.7	11
d. taking a leadership role in the planning of English proficiency standards or proficiency test contents (for Hart Bill requirements)	1.3	3.3	48.7	15.7	17.7	13.3
e. giving presentations at inservice or professional meetings	1	3	49.3	18.3	18	10.3
f. organizing or coordinating an inservice program	1	3.7	55	13.3	15	12
g. other professional activities related to the teaching of writing (please describe)	.3	2.3	37.7	8	12	39.7

16. Now that you have had a chance to reflect, give an overall rating of the usefulness of the BAWP training in assisting you to become a better teacher of writing. (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1 Of little Use	2	3 Some Use	4	5 A Great Deal of Use	Blank
1.7%	1.7%	16%	23%	51%	6.7%

17. In light of your assessment of the overall impact of your BAWP experiences, please make any specific criticisms or endorsements of the training that you care to, or suggestions for improvement of future activities.

18. What subjects do you teach?
24.7% (1) English classes which focus on teaching writing
12.3 (2) English-writing classes plus _____ classes
(specify subject(s))
12 (3) General English language/literature
9.3 (4) General English lang./lit. plus _____ classes
(specify subjects)
33.7 (5) Other (specify) _____
6 Blank

19. How many years have you been teaching?
10.3% (1) 0-5 years
25 (2) 6-10 years
24.7 (3) 11-15 years
19.3 (4) 16-20 years
12 (5) over 20 years
2.7 Blank

20. What grade level(s) do you teach?
20.7% (1) K-6
16.3 (2) 7-8
50 (3) 9-12
5 (4) 13+
8 Blank

21. What grade level(s) did you teach at the time of your BAWP training?
23% (1) K-6
16.7 (2) 7-8
48.7 (3) 9-12
5 (4) 13+
7.7 Blank

22. What is the total number of students you teach per day?
9.7% (1) 1-25
14.7 (2) 26-50
6.7 (3) 51-75
7.3 (4) 76-100
13.7 (5) 101-125
30.3% (6) 126-150
7.7 (7) 151-175
1 (8) 176-200
.7 (9) over 200
9.3 Blank

23. What is the total number of students to whom you teach writing?
11.3% (1) 1-25
19.7 (2) 26-50
11 (3) 51-75
11 (4) 76-100
11.3% (5) 101-125
17.7 (6) 126-150
3.7 (7) 151-175
.3 (8) 176-200
.3% (9) over 200
13.7 Blank

24. How many teachers attended your BAWP inservice meetings on the average?
6.7% (1) less than 10
29.3 (2) 11-20
33.3 (3) 21-30
10.7 (4) 31-40
3.3 (5) over 40
16.6 (6) don't remember

26. If you wish, please make any other comments about BAWP training, its activities or effects which have not been described in your responses to the previous questions. (Please attach additional pages if you need more space to respond.)

( ) Check here if you wish a summary of the findings.

APPENDIX B
RANKINGS ON QUESTION 9

	FREQUENCY							RANK						
	CELL ONE	CELL TWO	CELL THREE	CELL FOUR	CELL FIVE	CELL SIX	OVERALL	CELL ONE	CELL TWO	CELL THREE	CELL FOUR	CELL FIVE	CELL SIX	OVERALL
(1)	5	8	4	28	5	54	104	14.5	26.5	13.5	16	11.5	22.5	19
(2)	0	3	2	9	0	17	31	1.5	10.5	4.5	3.5	1.5	5	3
(3)	8	6	6	25	7	27	79	21	22	20	11.5	17	9	11
(4)	4	2	7	27	7	42	89	11	6.5	23	13.5	17	15.5	15
(5)	10	6	8	47	12	55	138	27	22	25	29	30.5	25	28
(6)	5	2	9	36	10	59	121	14.5	6.5	28	19.5	27	27	21
(7)	2	0	4	27	9	50	92	5.5	1.5	13.5	13.5	24.5	18	16
(8)	8	5	6	28	5	33	85	21	19	20	16	11.5	12	12.5
(9)	1	3	3	14	1	10	32	3	10.5	8.5	5.5	4	3	4
(10)	2	2	1	9	1	19	34	5.5	6.5	1.5	3.5	4	6	5
(11)	3	1	1	14	5	21	45	8.5	3.5	1.5	5.5	11.5	7	7
(12)	13	5	11	44	12	63	148	30	19	30.5	26.5	30.5	29.5	30
(13)	9	6	11	40	8	55	129	24.5	22	30.5	23	20.5	25	24
(14)	2	8	4	17	2	42	75	5.5	26.5	13.5	7.5	6.5	15.5	10
(15)	14	11	8	46	11	67	157	31	31	25	28	28.5	31	31
(16)	5	1	3	23	3	23	58	14.5	3.5	8.5	9	8	8	8
(17)	12	3	6	33	6	55	115	29	10.5	20	18	14.5	25	20
(18)	2	0	2	5	0	5	14	5.5	1.5	4.5	2	1.5	1.5	1
(19)	0	3	2	3	?	5	15	1.5	10.5	4.5	1	6.5	1.5	2
(20)	9	9	6	51	11	54	140	24.5	29	20	31	28.5	22.5	29
(21)	3	10	5	50	8	51	132	21	30	17	30	20.5	19	26.5
(22)	4	4	4	17	1	13	43	11	15	13.5	7.5	4	4	6
(23)	3	5	3	42	8	63	124	8.5	19	8.5	24.5	20.5	29.5	23
(24)	6	2	2	28	9	41	88	17.5	6.5	4.5	16	24.5	14	14
(25)	9	8	8	37	6	62	130	24.5	26.5	25	21	14.5	28	25
(26)	5	4	3	24	4	45	85	14.5	15	8.5	10	9	17	12.5
(27)	11	7	9	44	9	52	132	28	24	28	26.5	24.5	20	26.5
(28)	9	4	6	42	9	53	123	24.5	15	20	24.5	24.5	21	22
(29)	4	4	4	25	7	28	72	11	15	13.5	11.5	17	10	9
(30)	6	8	4	36	8	40	102	17.5	26.5	13.5	19.5	20.5	13	18
(31)	7	4	9	39	5	29	93	19	15	28	22	11.5	11	17

CELL ONE -1-

4-79

APPENDIX C

Frequency of Response for Cell One - Elementary Emphasis Participants

Survey of Past Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP) Participants

1. Type of participation (check one)
   - 0% (1) Summer Invitational Program
   - 92 (2) School district inservice (name district _____)
   - 0 (3) UC extension

2. Year of participation (check one)

School Year		Summer	
0%	(1) 1974-75	____	(7) 1974
8	(2) 1975-76	____	(8) 1975
44	(3) 1976-77	____	(9) 1976
20	(4) 1977-78	____	(10) 1977
12	(5) 1978-79	____	(11) 1978
16	(6) don't remember	____	(12) don't remember

3. Length of BAWP training program (check one)
   - 8% (1) 1 or 2 days duration
   - 0 (2) 2-3 weeks duration (e.g. extension format)
   - 60 (3) 8-10 weeks duration
   - 20 (4) other; please describe
   - 12 (5) don't remember

4. What were the grade levels of the teachers represented in your training?
   - 16% (1) K-12
   - 12 (2) K-6
   - 0 (3) 7-12
   - 4 (4) 7-9
   - 0 (5) 9-12
   - 56 (6) other; please describe
   - 12 (7) don't know or don't remember

5. Approximately what percentage of the sessions did you attend?
   - 0% (1) less than 25%
   - 12 (2) 25-50%
   - 12 (3) 51-75%
   - 68 (4) more than 75%
   - 8 (5) don't remember

6. How important were each of the following reasons for your enrolling in the BAWP training program?

	Not Very Important 1	2	3	4	Very Important 5	Blank
a. to meet district or department requirements	36%	8%	12%	0%	24%	20%
b. to obtain district credit	44	0	16	8	4	28
c. to obtain university or college credit	52	0	8	4	8	28
d. to learn more about teaching writing in general	0	0	12	16	52	20
e. to learn how to handle specific writing problems	8	4	16	8	44	20
f. other: please describe	Not Coded					

7. How would you rate your level of participation in the BAWP training? (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1	2	3	4	5	Blank
4%	0%	16%	36%	36%	8%
Active Withdrawal		Passive Attendance		Enthusiastic Participation	

8. What has been your subsequent involvement with BAWP activities (check all that apply)
   - ____ (1) none
   - 0 (2) BAWP open session summer participant
   - 0 (3) BAWP summer invitational fellow
   - 0 (4) BAWP consultant
   - 4 (5) BAWP coordinator

Not Coded (6) other: please describe

CELL ONE

9. Below are a list of techniques and strategies for teaching writing that might have been presented during your BAWF training. Please indicate in the space provided whether the item is one which you:

1 = Have never heard of
2 = Have heard of but do not use regularly
3 = Implemented (or revised) as a result of your BAWF experiences and use regularly
4 = Use regularly, but not necessarily as a result of your BAWF experiences

____ (1) BAWF stressed sentence writing activities (e.g. sentence combining, Jo Miles predication, etc.)
____ (2) thesis formation (e.g. Tandy's controversial theses, etc.)
____ (3) essay organization (e.g. coherence, focus, etc.)
____ (4) diction (e.g. showing not telling, etc.)
____ (5) increasing the number of different types of student writing (e.g. expressive, expository, practical, etc.)
____ (6) writing from different points of view
____ (7) writing in different voices
____ (8) using modeling or imitation of forms or styles
____ (9) dictation
____ (10) saturation reporting
____ (11) "right-brain" activities (e.g. humanities, poetry, etc.)
____ (12) teaching writing as a process through prewriting activities
____ (13) teaching writing as a process through rewriting and revising
____ (14) using writing sequences (e.g. specific to abstract; personal to public, etc.)
____ (15) use of peer feedback (writing-editing groups)
____ (16) teacher-student writing conferences
____ (17) holistic marking of student papers
____ (18) writing contracts
____ (19) individualized practice sheets
____ (20) increasing the amount of in class time devoted to writing
____ (21) increasing the number of in class writing assignments
____ (22) increasing the number of homework assignments
____ (23) writing along with student
____ (24) changing the relationship of writing to other language arts activities (e.g. reading, oral language)
____ (25) increasing number of audiences who read student work (e.g. other students, other adults, etc.)
____ (26) increasing amount of authentic written discourse (writing for real audiences)
____ (27) increasing variety of writing topics
____ (28) increasing exploratory writing (e.g. free writing, journal writing)
____ (29) increasing assignments suited to certain types of students (e.g. reluctant students, gifted students)
____ (30) increasing supportive, rewarding responses to students
____ (31) changing the grading strategies
____ (32) other (please describe)

See Appendix B for list of frequencies and item rankings for Question 9.

10. Please indicate the degree of impact that BAWF training has had, in general, on your students' attitudes and skills (explain your ratings if you wish):

	Greatly Decreased 1	2	No Change 3	4	Greatly Increased 5	Don't Know
a. students' valuing of writing	0%	0%	4%	24%	20%	52%
b. students' enjoyment of writing	0	0	8	40	12	40
c. students' confidence in their writing ability	0	0	0	28	20	52
d. students' overall writing skill	0	0	4	20	20	56
e. other: please describe	Not Coded					

CELL ONE

11. In your BAWP training program, how many of the following kinds of writing assignments did you do? (Circle one response for each type of assignment)

Number of Assignments

	0	1-3	4-6	[illegible]	10 or more	don't know/ don't remember
a. brief assignments (5-25 minutes during a training session)	4%	40%	24%	8%	0%	24%
	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7 or more	don't know/ don't remember
b. longer assignments (over 30 minutes perhaps completed at home)	12%	36%	8%	4%	4%	36%

12. In the present school year, please estimate how many hours, on the average, you spend each week on the following activities:

	less than 1 hour	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	more than 9 hrs.	Blank
a. preparing curriculum materials	12%	8%	32%	4%	4%	4%	36%
b. writing along with students	56	8	8	0	0	0	28
c. your own creative writing	48	16	4	0	0	0	32
d. grading student papers	4	8	8	16	12	20	32
e. conferencing with individual students (during and after class)	4	32	28	4	4	0	28

13. Please indicate the degree of impact you think the BAWP experience has had on:

	Greatly Decreased 1	2	No Change 3	4	Greatly Increased 5	Don't Know
a. your ability to relate practices in teaching writing to theories about teaching writing	0%	0%	24%	32%	24%	20%
b. your efficiency as a writer	0	4	44	32	4	16
c. your confidence in teaching writing	0	0	12	44	24	20
d. your level of skill in teaching writing	0	0	16	40	8	36
e. other: please describe	Not Coded					

14. Please indicate overall the amount of support or opposition that you have encountered in the school or district environment in your attempts to implement changes in teaching writing. (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1	2	3	4	5	Blank
0%	12%	20%	16%	36%	16%
Strong Opposition		Neutral		Strong Support	

15. Please indicate to what extent the frequency of the following activities has changed due to your participation in the BAWP training program (and explain your ratings if you wish):

	Greatly Decreased 1	2	No Change 3	4	Greatly Increased 5	Don't Know
a. discussions with fellow teachers on the teaching of writing	0%	0%	24%	44%	20%	12%
b. collaborative activities with other teachers (e.g. team teaching)	0	0	60	12	4	24
c. taking a leadership role in the planning of school site or district writing programs	0	4	64	0	12	20
d. taking a leadership role in the planning of English proficiency standards or proficiency test contents (for Hart Bill requirements)	0	4	60	0	12	24
e. giving presentations at inservice or professional meetings	0	4	68	4	8	16
f. organizing or coordinating an inservice program	0	4	68	4	8	16
g. other professional activities related to the teaching of writing (please describe)	0	4	48	12	0	36

CELL ONE

16. Now that you have had a chance to reflect, give an overall rating of the usefulness of the BAWP training in assisting you to become a better teacher of writing. (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1 Of little Use	2	3 Some Use	4	5 A Great Deal of Use	Blank
0%	4%	28%	20%	28%	20%

17. In light of your assessment of the overall impact of your BAWP experiences, please make any specific criticisms or endorsements of the training that you care to, or suggestions for improvement of future activities.

18. What subjects do you teach?
- 0% (1) English classes which focus on teaching writing
- 8 (2) English-writing classes plus _____ classes (specify subject(s))
- 20 (3) General English language/literature
- 16 (4) General English lang./lit. plus _____ classes (specify subjects)
- 40 (5) Other (specify) _____
- 16 Blank

19. How many years have you been teaching?
- 0% (1) 0-5 years
- 16 (2) 6-10 years
- 36 (3) 11-15 years
- 12 (4) 16-20 years
- 24 (5) over 20 years
- 12 Blank

20. What grade level(s) do you teach?
- 52% (1) K-6
- 36 (2) 7-8
- 0 (3) 9-12
- 0 (4) 13+
- 12 Blank

21. What grade level(s) did you teach at the time of your BAWP training?
- 52% (1) K-6
- 36 (2) 7-8
- 0 (3) 9-12
- 0 (4) 13+
- 12 Blank

22. What is the total number of students you teach per day?
- 16% (1) 1-25
- 32 (2) 26-50
- 4 (3) 51-75
- 8 (4) 76-100
- 12 (5) 101-125
- 12% (6) 126-150
- 0 (7) 151-175
- 0 (8) 176-200
- 0 (9) over 200
- 16 Blank

23. What is the total number of students to whom you teach writing?
- 16% (1) 1-25
- 36 (2) 26-50
- 4 (3) 51-75
- 8 (4) 76-100
- 8% (5) 101-125
- 4 (6) 126-150
- 0 (7) 151-175
- 0 (8) 176-200
- 0% (9) over 200
- 24 Blank

24. How many teachers attended your BAWP inservice meetings on the average?
- 12% (1) less than 10
- 36 (2) 11-20
- 16 (3) 21-30
- 12 (4) 31-40
- 4 (5) over 40
- 20 (6) don't remember

26. If you wish, please make any other comments about BAWP training, its activities or effects which have not been described in your responses to the previous questions. (Please attach additional pages if you need more space to respond.)

( ) Check here if you wish a summary of the findings.

CELL TWO -1-

APPENDIX D

4-79 Frequency of Response for Cell Two - 1975 Secondary Participants

Survey of Past Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP) Participants

1. Type of participation (check one)
   - 5.3% (1) Summer Invitational Program
   - 63.2 (2) School district inservice (name district _____)
   - 31.6 (3) UC extension

2. Year of participation (check one)

School Year		Summer	
21.1%	(1) 1974-75	5.3%	(7) 1974
47.4	(2) 1975-76	0	(8) 1975
15.8	(3) 1976-77	0	(9) 1976
5.3	(4) 1977-78	0	(10) 1977
0	(5) 1978-79	5.3	(11) 1978
0	(6) don't remember	0	(12) don't remember

3. Length of BAWP training program (check one)
   - 5.3% (1) 1 or 2 days duration
   - 21.1 (2) 2-3 weeks duration (e.g. extension format)
   - 52.6 (3) 8-10 weeks duration
   - 15.8 (4) other; please describe
   - 5.3 (5) don't remember

4. What were the grade levels of the teachers represented in your training?
   - 10.5% (1) K-12
   - 0 (2) K-6
   - 52.6 (3) 7-12
   - 10.5 (4) 7-9
   - 10.5 (5) 9-12
   - 0 (6) other; please describe
   - 10.8 (7) don't know or don't remember

5. Approximately what percentage of the sessions did you attend?
   - 5.3% (1) less than 25%
   - 0 (2) 25-50%
   - 0 (3) 51-75%
   - 94.7 (4) more than 75%
   - 0 (5) don't remember

6. How important were each of the following reasons for your enrolling in the BAWP training program?

	Not Very Important 1	2	3	4	Very Important 5	Blank
a. to meet district or department requirements	47.4%	15.8%	5.3%	0 %	21.1%	10.5%
b. to obtain district credit	31.6	5.3	21.1	5.3	15.8	21.1
c. to obtain university or college credit	31.6	5.3	31.6	0	5.3	26.3
d. to learn more about teaching writing in general	0	0	5.3	10.5	78.9	5.3
e. to learn how to handle specific writing problems	0	0	10.5	10.5	63.2	15.8
f. other: please describe	Not Coded					

7. How would you rate your level of participation in the BAWP training? (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1	2	3	4	5	Blank
0%	5.3%	15.8%	36.8%	42.1%	0%
Active Withdrawal		Passive Attendance		Enthusiastic Participation	

8. What has been your subsequent involvement with BAWP activities (check all that apply)
   - 79% (1) none
   - 6 (2) BAWP open session summer participant
   - 0 (3) BAWP summer invitational fellow
   - 0 (4) BAWP consultant
   - 0 (5) BAWP coordinator
   - Not Coded (6) other: please describe

CELL TWO

9. Below are a list of techniques and strategies for teaching writing that might have been presented during your BAWF training. Please indicate in the space provided whether the item is one which you:

1 = Have never heard of
2 = Have heard of but do not use regularly
3 = Implemented (or revised) as a result of your BAWF experiences and use regularly
4 = Use regularly, but not necessarily as a result of your BAWF experiences

_____ (1) BAWP stressed sentence writing activities (e.g. sentence combining, Jo Miles predication, etc.)
_____ (2) thesis formation (e.g. Tandy's controversial theses, etc.)
_____ (3) essay organization (e.g. coherence, focus, etc.)
_____ (4) diction (e.g. showing not telling, etc.)
_____ (5) increasing the number of different types of student writing (e.g. expressive, expository, practical, etc.)
_____ (6) writing from different points of view
_____ (7) writing in different voices
_____ (8) using modeling or imitation of forms or styles
_____ (9) dictation
_____ (10) saturation reporting
_____ (11) "right-brain" activities (e.g. humanities, poetry, etc.)
_____ (12) teaching writing as a process through prewriting activities
_____ (13) teaching writing as a process through rewriting and revising
_____ (14) using writing sequences (e.g. specific to abstract; personal to public, etc.)
_____ (15) use of peer feedback (writing-editing groups)
_____ (16) teacher-student writing conferences
_____ (17) holistic marking of student papers
_____ (18) writing contracts
_____ (19) individualized practice sheets
_____ (20) increasing the amount of in class time devoted to writing
_____ (21) increasing the number of in class writing assignments
_____ (22) increasing the number of homework assignments
_____ (23) writing along with student
_____ (24) changing the relationship of writing to other language arts activities (e.g. reading, oral language)
_____ (25) increasing number of audiences who read student work (e.g. other students, other adults, etc.)
_____ (26) increasing amount of authentic written discourse (writing for real audiences)
_____ (27) increasing variety of writing topics
_____ (28) increasing exploratory writing (e.g. free writing, journal writing)
_____ (29) increasing assignments suited to certain types of students (e.g. reluctant students, gifted students)
_____ (30) increasing supportive, rewarding responses to students
_____ (31) changing the grading strategies
_____ (32) other (please describe)

See Appendix B for list of frequencies and item rankings for Question 9.

10. Please indicate the degree of impact that BAWF training has had, in general, on your students' attitudes and skills (explain your ratings if you wish):

	Greatly Decreased 1	2	No Change 3	Greatly Increased 4	5	Don't Know
a. students' valuing of writing	0 %	0 %	15.8 %	36.8 %	31.6 %	15.8 %
b. students' enjoyment of writing	0	0	21.1	36.8	21.1	21.1
c. students' confidence in their writing ability	0	0	5.3	52.6	21.1	21.1
d. students' overall writing skill	0	0	0	52.6	21.1	26.3
e. other: please describe	Not Coded					

CELL TWO -3-

11. In your BAWP training program, how many of the following kinds of writing assignments did you do? (Circle one response for each type of assignment)

	Number of Assignments					
a. brief assignments (5-25 minutes during a training session)	0	1-3	4-6	7-9	10 or more	don't know/ don't remember
	0%	31.6%	26.3%	0%	15.8%	26.3%
b. longer assignments (over 30 minutes perhaps completed at home)	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7 or more	don't know/ don't remember
	21.1%	36.8%	5.3%	5.3%	0%	31.6%

12. In the present school year, please estimate how many hours, on the average, you spend each week on the following activities:

	less than 1 hour	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	more than 9 hrs.	Blank
a. preparing curriculum materials	0 %	15.8%	10.5%	15.8%	26.3%	26.3%	5.3%
b. writing along with students	47.4	21.1	21.1	0	5.3	0	5.3
c. your own creative writing	52.6	21.1	5.3	0	10.5	5.3	5.3
d. grading student papers	10.5	5.3	10.5	21.1	10.5	36.8	5.3
e. conferencing with individual students (during and after class)	10.5	26.3	15.8	15.8	5.3	21.1	5.3

13. Please indicate the degree of impact you think the BAWP experience has had on:

	Greatly Decreased		No Change		Greatly Increased	Don't Know
	1	2	3	4	5	
a. your ability to relate practices in teaching writing to theories about teaching writing	0 %	0 %	0 %	52.6%	42.1%	5.3%
b. your efficiency as a writer	0	5.3	42.1	36.8	5.3	10.5
c. your confidence in teaching writing	0	0	5.3	52.6	26.3	15.8
d. your level of skill in teaching writing	0	0	0	57.9	21.1	21.1
e. other: please describe	Not Coded					

14. Please indicate overall the amount of support or opposition that you have encountered in the school or district environment in your attempts to implement changes in teaching writing. (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1	2	3	4	5	Blank
5.3%	26.3%	0 %	15.8%	47.4%	5.3%
Strong Opposition		Neutral		Strong Support	

15. Please indicate to what extent the frequency of the following activities has changed due to your participation in the BAWP training program (and explain your ratings if you wish):

	Greatly Decreased	No Change		Greatly Increased		Don't Know
	1	2	3	4	5	
a. discussions with fellow teachers on the teaching of writing	0%	0 %	42.1%	31.6 %	21.1%	5.3%
b. collaborative activities with other teachers (e.g. team teaching)	0	5.3	57.9	21.1	10.5	5.3
c. taking a leadership role in the planning of school site or district writing programs	0	0	63.2	15.8	15.8	5.3
d. taking a leadership role in the planning of English proficiency standards or proficiency test contests (for Hart Bill requirements)	0	0	63.2	15.8	15.8	5.3
e. giving presentations at inservice or professional meetings	0	5.3	78.9	10.5	0	5.3
f. organizing or coordinating an inservice program	0	10.5	78.9	5.3	0	5.3
g. other professional activities related to the teaching of writing (please describe)	0	5.3	52.6	5.3	10.5	26.3

CELL TWO

16. Now that you have had a chance to reflect, give an overall rating of the usefulness of the BAWP training in assisting you to become a better teacher of writing. (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1 Of little Use	2	3 Some Use	4	5 A Great Deal of Use	Blank
0%	0%	15.8%	21.1%	57.9%	5.3%

17. In light of your assessment of the overall impact of your BAWP experiences, please make any specific criticisms or endorsements of the training that you care to, or suggestions for improvement of future activities.

18. What subjects do you teach?
34.2% (1) English classes which focus on teaching writing
5.3 (2) English-writing classes plus _____ classes
(specify subject(s))
15.8 (3) General English language/literature
15.8 (4) General English lang./lit. plus _____ classes
(specify subjects)
26.3 (5) Other (specify) _____
0 Blank

19. How many years have you been teaching?
10.5% (1) 0-5 years
36.8 (2) 6-10 years
15.8 (3) 11-15 years
5.3 (4) 16-20 years
31.6 (5) over 20 years
0 Blank

20. What grade level(s) do you teach?
5.3% (1) K-6
26.3 (2) 7-8
63.2 (3) 9-12
0 (4) 13+
5.3 Blank

21. What grade level(s) did you teach at the time of your BAWP training?
5.3% (1) K-6
26.3 (2) 7-8
63.2 (3) 9-12
0 (4) 13+
5.3 Blank

22. What is the total number of students you teach per day?
5.3% (1) 1-25
0 (2) 26-50
15.8 (3) 51-75
5.3 (4) 76-100
15.8 (5) 101-125
31.6% (6) 126-150
21.1 (7) 151-175
5.3 (8) 176-200
0 (9) over 200
0 Blank

23. What is the total number of students to whom you teach writing?
5.3% (1) 1-25
10.5 (2) 26-50
21.1 (3) 51-75
5.3 (4) 76-100
15.8% (5) 101-125
15.8 (6) 176-150
10.5 (7) 151-175
5.3 (8) 176-200
0% (9) over 200
10.5 Blank

24. How many teachers attended your BAWP inservice meetings on the average?
0 % (1) less than 10
15.8 (2) 11-20
31.6 (3) 21-30
31.6 (4) 31-40
0 (5) over 40
20.1 (6) don't remember

26. If you wish, please make any other comments about BAWP training, its activities or effects which have not been described in your responses to the previous questions. (Please attach additional pages if you need more space to respond.)

( ) Check here if you wish a summary of the findings.

CELL THREE -1-

APPENDIX E

4-79 Frequency of Response for Cell Three - 1976 Secondary Participants

Survey of Past Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP) Participants

1. Type of participation (check one)
   - 95% (1) Summer Invitational Program
   - 85.7 (2) School district inservice (name district _____)
   - 4.8 (3) UC extension

2. Year of participation (check one)

School Year		Summer	
0%	(1) 1974-75	0%	(7) 1974
9.5	(2) 1975-76	0	(8) 1975
38.1	(3) 1976-77	0	(9) 1976
28.6	(4) 1977-78	19	(10) 1977
4.8	(5) 1978-79	0	(11) 1978
0	(6) don't remember	0	(12) don't remember

3. Length of BAWP training program (check one)
   - 0% (1) 1 or 2 days duration
   - 9.5 (2) 2-3 weeks duration (e.g. extension format)
   - 61.9 (3) 8-10 weeks duration
   - 23.8 (4) other; please describe
   - 4.8 (5) don't remember

4. What were the grade levels of the teachers represented in your training?
   - 19% (1) K-12
   - 0 (2) K-6
   - 28.6 (3) 7-12
   - 4.8 (4) 7-9
   - 38.1 (5) 9-12
   - 0 (6) other; please describe
   - 9.5 (7) don't know or don't remember

5. Approximately what percentage of the sessions did you attend?
   - 0% (1) less than 25%
   - 0 (2) 25-50%
   - 9.5 (3) 51-75%
   - 90.5 (4) more than 75%
   - 0 (5) don't remember

6. How important were each of the following reasons for your enrolling in the BAWP training program?

	Not Very Important 1	2	3	4	Very Important 5	Blank
a. to meet district or department requirements	42.9%	4.8%	19%	9.5%	4.8%	19%
b. to obtain district credit	33.3	9.5	4.8	4.8	19	28.6
c. to obtain university or college credit	38.1	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	42.9
d. to learn more about teaching writing in general	0	0	4.8	28.6	57.1	9.5
e. to learn how to handle specific writing problems	0	4.8	9.5	14.3	57.1	14.3
f. other: please describe	Not Coded					

7. How would you rate your level of participation in the BAWP training? (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1	2	3	4	5	Blank
0%	0%	14.3%	52.4%	28.6%	4.8%
Active Withdrawal		Passive Attendance		Enthusiastic Participation	

8. What has been your subsequent involvement with BAWP activities (check all that apply)
   - 81% (1) none
   - 4.8 (2) BAWP open session summer participant
   - 0 (3) BAWP summer invitational fellow
   - 4.8 (4) BAWP consultant
   - 9.5 (5) BAWP coordinator

Not Coded (6) other: please describe

CELL THREE

9. Below are a list of techniques and strategies for teaching writing that might have been presented during your BAWP training. Please indicate in the space provided whether the item is one which you:

1 = Have never heard of
2 = Have heard of but do not use regularly
3 = Implemented (or revised) as a result of your BAWP experiences and use regularly
4 = Use regularly, but not necessarily as a result of your BAWP experiences

____ (1) BAWP stressed sentence writing activities (e.g. sentence combining, Jo Miles predication, etc.)
____ (2) thesis formation (e.g. Thndy's controversial theses, etc.)
____ (3) essay organization (e.g. coherence, focus, etc.)
____ (4) diction (e.g. showing not telling, etc.)
____ (5) increasing the number of different types of student writing (e.g. expressive, expository, practical, etc.)
____ (6) writing from different points of view
____ (7) writing in different voices
____ (8) using modeling or imitation of forms or styles
____ (9) dictation
____ (10) saturation reporting
____ (11) "right-brain" activities (e.g. humanities, poetry, etc.)
____ (12) teaching writing as a process through prewriting activities
____ (13) teaching writing as a process through rewriting and revising
____ (14) using writing sequences (e.g. specific to abstract; personal to public, etc.)
____ (15) use of peer feedback (writing-editing groups)
____ (16) teacher-student writing conferences
____ (17) holistic marking of student papers
____ (18) writing contracts
____ (19) individualized practice sheets
____ (20) increasing the amount of in class time devoted to writing
____ (21) increasing the number of in class writing assignments
____ (22) increasing the number of homework assignments
____ (23) writing along with student
____ (24) changing the relationship of writing to other language arts activities (e.g. reading, oral language)
____ (25) increasing number of audiences who read student work (e.g. other students, other adults, etc.)
____ (26) increasing amount of authentic written discourse (writing for real audiences)
____ (27) increasing variety of writing topics
____ (28) increasing exploratory writing (e.g. free writing, journal writing)
____ (29) increasing assignments suited to certain types of students (e.g. reluctant students, gifted students)
____ (30) increasing supportive, rewarding responses to students
____ (31) changing the grading strategies
____ (32) other (please describe)

See Appendix B for list of frequencies and item rankings for Question 9.

10. Please indicate the degree of impact that BAWP training has had, in general, on your students' attitudes and skills (explain your ratings if you wish):

	Greatly Decreased 1	2	No Change 3	Greatly Increased 4	5	Don't Know
a. students' valuing of writing	0 %	0 %	33.3%	23.8%	4.8%	38.1%
b. students' enjoyment of writing	0	0	42.9	33.3	0	23.8
c. students' confidence in their writing ability	0	0	19	47.6	4.8	28.6
d. students' overall writing skill	0	0	9.5	42.9	14.3	33.3
e. other: please describe	Not Coded					

CELL THREE

11. In your BAWP training program, how many of the following kinds of writing assignments did you do? (Circle one response for each type of assignment)

Number of Assignments

	0	1-3	4-6	7-9	10 or more	don't know/ don't remember
a. brief assignments (5-25 minutes during a training session)	0%	23.8%	28.6%	19%	4.8%	23.8%
	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7 or more	don't know/ don't remember
b. longer assignments (over 30 minutes perhaps completed at home)	33.3%	38.1%	14.3%	9.5%	0%	14.3%

12. In the present school year, please estimate how many hours, on the average, you spend each week on the following activities:

	less than 1 hour	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	more than 9 hrs.	Blank
a. preparing curriculum materials	0%	19%	19%	28.6%	4.8%	14.3%	14.3%
b. writing along with students	47.6	14.3	4.8	4.8	0	0	28.6
c. your own creative writing	57.1	4.8	4.8	4.8	0	0	23.6
d. grading student papers	0	4.8	14.3	23.8	4.8	33.3	19
e. conferencing with individual students (during and after class)	14.3	47.6	14.3	4.8	9.5	4.8	4.8

13. Please indicate the degree of impact you think the BAWP experience has had on:

	Greatly Decreased 1	2	No Change 3	4	Greatly Increased 5	Don't Know
a. your ability to relate practices in teaching writing to theories about teaching writing	0%	0%	33.3%	33.3%	9.5%	23.8%
b. your efficiency as a writer	0	4.8	38.1	28.6	4.8	23.8
c. your confidence in teaching writing	4.8	0	19	33.3	28.6	14.3
d. your level of skill in teaching writing	0	4.8	9.5	38.1	14.3	33.3
e. other: please describe	Not Coded					

14. Please indicate overall the amount of support or opposition that you have encountered in the school or district environment in your attempts to implement changes in teaching writing. (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1	2	3	4	5	Blank
0%	4.8%	19%	42.9%	19%	14.3%
Strong Opposition		Neutral		Strong Support	

15. Please indicate to what extent the frequency of the following activities has changed due to your participation in the BAWP training program (and explain your ratings if you wish):

	Greatly Decreased 1	2	No Change 3	4	Greatly Increased 5	Don't Know
a. discussions with fellow teachers on the teaching of writing	0%	0%	28.6%	61.9%	9.5%	0%
b. collaborative activities with other teachers (e.g. team teaching)	0	4.8	61.9	28.6	4.8	0
c. taking a leadership role in the planning of school site or district writing programs	0	4.8	66.7	14.3	14.3	0
d. taking a leadership role in the planning of English proficiency standards or proficiency test contents (for Hart Bill requirements)	0	4.8	57.1	19	14.3	4.8
e. giving presentations at inservice or professional meetings	0	4.8	71.4	14.3	4.8	4.8
f. organizing or coordinating an inservice program	0	4.8	71.4	9.5	9.5	4.8
g. other professional activities related to the teaching of writing (please describe)	0	4.8	57.1	4.8	0	33.3

CELL THREE

16. Now that you have had a chance to reflect, give an overall rating of the usefulness of the BAWP training in assisting you to become a better teacher of writing. (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1 Of little Use	2	3 Some Use	4	5 A Great Deal of Use	Blank
0 %	9.5 %	38.1 %	28.6 %	23.8 %	0 %

17. In light of your assessment of the overall impact of your BAWP experiences, please make any specific criticisms or endorsements of the training that you care to, or suggestions for improvement of future activities.

18. What subjects do you teach?
14.3% (1) English classes which focus on teaching writing
33.3 (2) English-writing classes plus _____ classes
(specify subject(s))
14.3 (3) General English language/literature
14.3 (4) General English lang./lit. plus _____ classes
(specify subjects)
19 (5) Other (specify) _____
4.8 Blank

19. How many years have you been teaching?
0 % (1) 0-5 years
28.6 (2) 6-10 years
42.9 (3) 11-15 years
14.3 (4) 16-20 years
14.3 (5) over 20 years
0 Blank

20. What grade level(s) do you teach?
4.8% (1) K-6
9.5 (2) 7-8
71.4 (3) 9-12
14.3 (4) 13+
0 Blank

21. What grade level(s) did you teach at the time of your BAWP training?
4.8% (1) K-6
9.5 (2) 7-8
71.4 (3) 9-12
0 (4) 13+
14.3 Blank

22. What is the total number of students you teach per day?
0 % (1) 1-25
9.5 (2) 26-50
0 (3) 51-75
4.8 (4) 76-100
19 (5) 101-125
47.6% (6) 126-150
14.3 (7) 151-175
0 (8) 176-200
4.8 (9) over 200
0 Blank

23. What is the total number of students to whom you teach writing?
14.3% (1) 1-25
4.8 (2) 26-50
9.5 (3) 51-75
19 (4) 76-100
14.3% (5) 101-125
23.8 (6) 126-150
9.5 (7) 151-175
0 (8) 176-200
0 % (9) over 200
4.8 Blank

24. How many teachers attended your BAWP inservice meetings on the average?
4.8% (1) less than 10
33.3 (2) 11-20
28.6 (3) 21-30
14.3 (4) 31-40
0 (5) over 40
19.1 (6) don't remember

26. If you wish, please make any other comments about BAWP training, its activities or effects which have not been described in your responses to the previous questions. (Please attach additional pages if you need more space to respond.)

(.) Check here if you wish a summary of the findings.

CELL FOUR
4-79

APPENDIX F

Frequency of Response for Cell Four - 1977 Secondary Participants

Survey of East Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP) Participants

1. Type of participation (check one)
   - 71% (1) Summer Invitational Program
   - 74.7 (2) School district inservice (name district _____)
   - 14.1 (3) UC extension
   - 4 Blank

2. Year of participation (check one)

School Year		Summer	
0%	(1) 1974-75	0%	(7) 1974
0	(2) 1975-76	0	(8) 1975
6.1	(3) 1976-77	2	(9) 1976
68.7	(4) 1977-78	0	(10) 1977
6.1	(5) 1978-79	10.1	(11) 1978
2	(6) don't remember	5	(12) don't remember

3. Length of BAWP training program (check one)
   - 1 % (1) 1 or 2 days duration
   - 0 (2) 2-3 weeks duration (e.g. extension format)
   - 71.7 (3) 8-10 weeks duration
   - 17.2 (4) other; please describe
   - 10.1 (5) don't remember

4. What were the grade levels of the teachers represented in your training?
   - 46.5% (1) K-12
   - 7.1 (2) K-6
   - 9.1 (3) 7-12
   - 2 (4) 7-9
   - 21.2 (5) 9-12
   - 10.1 (6) other; please describe
   - 4 (7) don't know or don't remember

5. Approximately what percentage of the sessions did you attend?
   - 1 % (1) less than 25%
   - 3 (2) 25-50%
   - 9.1 (3) 51-75%
   - 83.8 (4) more than 75%
   - 3 (5) don't remember

6. How important were each of the following reasons for your enrolling in the BAWP training program?

	Not Very Important 1	2	3	4	Very Important 5	Blank
a. to meet district or department requirements	65.7%	10.1%	4 %	7.1 %	2 %	11.1%
b. to obtain district credit	43.4	11.1	12.1	9.1	15.2	9.1
c. to obtain university or college credit	48.5	7.1	11.1	9.1	10.1	14.1
d. to learn more about teaching writing in general	2	0	6.1	18.2	67.7	6.1
e. to learn how to handle specific writing problems	3	2	15.2	16.2	52.5	11.1
f. other: please describe	Not Coded					

7. How would you rate your level of participation in the BAWP training? (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1	2	3	4	5	Blank
0 %	0 %	9.1 %	43.4 %	40.4 %	7.1%
Active Withdrawal		Passive Attendance		Enthusiastic Participation	

8. What has been your subsequent involvement with BAWP activities (check all that apply)
   - 72% (1) none
   - 5 (2) BAWP open session summer participant
   - 0 (3) BAWP summer invitational fellow
   - 3 (4) BAWP consultant
   - 0 (5) BAWP coordinator

Not Coded (6) other: please describe

CELL FOUR

9. Below are a list of techniques and strategies for teaching writing that might have been presented during your BAWP training. Please indicate in the space provided whether the item is one which you:

1 = Have never heard of
2 = Have heard of but do not use regularly
3 = Implemented (or revised) as a result of your BAWP experiences and use regularly
4 = Use regularly, but not necessarily as a result of your BAWP experiences

____ (1) BAWP stressed sentence writing activities (e.g. sentence combining, Jo Miles predication, etc.)
____ (2) thesis formation (e.g. Tandy's controversial theses, etc.)
____ (3) essay organization (e.g. coherence, focus, etc.)
____ (4) diction (e.g. showing not telling, etc.)
____ (5) increasing the number of different types of student writing (e.g. expressive, expository, practical, etc.)
____ (6) writing from different points of view
____ (7) writing in different voices
____ (8) using modeling or imitation of forms or styles
____ (9) dictation
____ (10) saturation reporting
____ (11) "right-brain" activities (e.g. humanities, poetry, etc.)
____ (12) teaching writing as a process through prewriting activities
____ (13) teaching writing as a process through rewriting and revising
____ (14) using writing sequences (e.g. specific to abstract; personal to public, etc.)
____ (15) use of peer feedback (writing-editing groups)
____ (16) teacher-student writing conferences
____ (17) holistic marking of student papers
____ (18) writing contracts
____ (19) individualized practice sheets
____ (20) increasing the amount of in class time devoted to writing
____ (21) increasing the number of in class writing assignments
____ (22) increasing the number of homework assignments
____ (23) writing along with student
____ (24) changing the relationship of writing to other language arts activities (e.g. reading, oral language)
____ (25) increasing number of audiences who read student work (e.g. other students, other adults, etc.)
____ (26) increasing amount of authentic written discourse (writing for real audiences)
____ (27) increasing variety of writing topics
____ (28) increasing exploratory writing (e.g. free writing, journal writing)
____ (29) increasing assignments suited to certain types of students (e.g. reluctant students, gifted students)
____ (30) increasing supportive, rewarding responses to students
____ (31) changing the grading strategies
____ (32) other (please describe)

See Appendix B for list of frequencies and item rankings for Question 9.

10. Please indicate the degree of impact that BAWP training has had, in general, on your students' attitudes and skills (explain your ratings if you wish):

	Greatly Decreased 1	2	No Change 3	4	Greatly Increased 5	Don't Know
a. students' valuing of writing	0 %	3 %	18.2 %	39.4 %	10.1 %	29.3 %
b. students' enjoyment of writing	0	4	16.2	35.4	18.2	26.3
c. students' confidence in their writing ability	0	2	16.2	48.5	15.2	18.2
d. students' overall writing skill	0	2	11.1	46.5	11.1	29.3
e. other: please describe	Not Coded					

CELL FOUR

11. In your BAWP training program, how many of the following kinds of writing assignments did you do? (Circle one response for each type of assignment)

Number of Assignments

	0	1-3	4-6	7-9	10 or more	don't know/ don't remember
a. brief assignments (5-25 minutes during a training session)	3%	21.2%	33.3%	13.1%	11.1%	18.2%
	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7 or more	don't know/ don't remember
b. longer assignments (over 30 minutes perhaps completed at home)	9.1%	38.4%	26.3%	9.1%	3%	14.1%

12. In the present school year, please estimate how many hours, on the average, you spend each week on the following activities:

	less than 1 hour	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	more than 9 hrs.	Blank
a. preparing curriculum materials	5.1%	20.2%	20.2%	15.2%	13.1%	10.1%	16.2%
b. writing along with students	49.5	24.2	11.1	0	1	0	14.1
c. your own creative writing	53.5	15.2	4	4	2	3	18.2
d. grading student papers	5.1	6.1	9.1	17.2	22.2	24.2	16.2
e. conferencing with individual students (during and after class)	8.1	25.3	18.2	17.2	6.1	10.1	15.2

13. Please indicate the degree of impact you think the BAWP experience has had on:

	Greatly Decreased 1	2	No Change 3	4	Greatly Increased 5	Don't Know
a. your ability to relate practices in teaching writing to theories about teaching writing	0 %	0 %	18.2%	47.5%	21.2%	13.1%
b. your efficiency as a writer	0	0	30.3	50.5	6.1	13.1
c. your confidence in teaching writing	1	0	13.1	43.4	32.3	10.1
d. your level of skill in teaching writing	0	0	11.1	45.5	34.2	19.2
e. other: please describe	Not Coded					

14. Please indicate overall the amount of support or opposition that you have encountered in the school or district environment in your attempts to implement changes in teaching writing. (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1	2	3	4	5	Blank
3 %	5.1 %	37.4 %	19.2 %	22.2 %	13.1%
Strong Opposition		Neutral		Strong Support	

15. Please indicate to what extent the frequency of the following activities has changed due to your participation in the BAWP training program (and explain your ratings if you wish):

	Greatly Decreased 1	2	No Change 3	4	Greatly Increased 5	Don't Know
a. discussions with fellow teachers on the teaching of writing	1%	3 %	22.2 %	41.4 %	24.2 %	8.1%
b. collaborative activities with other teachers (e.g. team teaching)	0	4	56.6	21.2	5.1	13.1
c. taking a leadership role in the planning of school site or district writing programs	1	5.1	57.6	13.1	11.1	12.1
d. taking a leadership role in the planning of English proficiency standards or proficiency test contents (for Hart Bill requirements)	3	4	53.5	19.2	8.1	12.1
e. giving presentations at inservice or professional meetings	3	4	7.6	14.1	5.1	12.1
f. organizing or coordinating an inservice program	3	5.1	65.7	9.1	4	13.1
g. other professional activities related to the teaching of writing (please describe)	1	4	43.4	4	8.1	39.4

-4-

CELL FOUR

16. Now that you have had a chance to reflect, give an overall rating of the usefulness of the BAWP training in assisting you to become a better teacher of writing. (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1 Of little Use	2	3 Some Use	4	5 A Great Deal of Use	Blank
2 %	1 %	20.2 %	29.3 %	41.4 %	6.1 %

17. In light of your assessment of the overall impact of your BAWP experiences, please make any specific criticisms or endorsements of the training that you care to, or suggestions for improvement of future activities.

18. What subjects do you teach?

24.2 % (1) English classes which focus on teaching writing
5.1 (2) English-writing classes plus _____ classes
(specify subject(s))
10.1 (3) General English language/literature
11.1 (4) General English lang./lit. plus _____ classes
(specify subjects)
43.4 (5) Other (specify) _____
6.1 Blank

19. How many years have you been teaching?

16.2 % (1) 0-5 years
25.3 (2) 6-10 years
17.2 (3) 11-15 years
23.2 (4) 16-20 years
15.2 (5) over 20 years
3 Blank

20. What grade level(s) do you teach?

23.2 % (1) K-6
19.2 (2) 7-8
50.5 (3) 9-12
1 (4) 13+
6.1 Blank

21. What grade level(s) did you teach at the time of your BAWP training?

25.3 % (1) K-6
18.2 (2) 7-8
49.5 (3) 9-12
1 (4) 13+
6.1 Blank

22. What is the total number of students you teach per day?

10.1 % (1) 1-25
13.1 (2) 26-50
6.1 (3) 51-75
6.1 (4) 76-100
15.2 (5) 101-125
29.3 % (6) 126-150
11.1 (7) 151-175
1 (8) 176-200
1 (9) over 200
8.1 Blank

23. What is the total number of students to whom you teach writing?

15.2 % (1) 1-25
19.2 (2) 26-50
14.1 (3) 51-75
9.1 (4) 76-100
11.1 (5) 101-125
14.1 (6) 126-150
4 (7) 151-175
0 (8) 176-200
0 % (9) over 200
13.1 Blank

24. How many teachers attended your BAWP inservice meetings on the average?

7.1 % (1) less than 10
44.4 (2) 11-20
28.3 (3) 21-30
10.1 (4) 31-40
3 (5) over 40
7.1 (6) don't remember

26. If you wish, please make any other comments about BAWP training, its activities or effects which have not been described in your responses to the previous questions. (Please attach additional pages if you need more space to respond.)

( ) Check here if you wish a summary of the findings.

CELL FIVE

APPENDIX G

4-79 Frequency of Response for Cell Five - University Extension Participants

Survey of Past Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP) Participants

1. Type of participation (check one)
   - 3 % (1) Summer Invitational Program
   - 12.5 (2) School district inservice (name district _____)
   - 9.3 (3) UC extension
   - 6.3 Blank

2. Year of participation (check one)

School Year		Summer	
0 %	(1) 1974-75	0 %	(7) 1974
3.1	(2) 1975-76	0	(8) 1975
9.4	(3) 1976-77	0	(9) 1976
15.6	(4) 1977-78	21.9	(10) 1977
12.5	(5) 1978-79	21.9	(11) 1978
3.1	(6) don't remember	12.5	(12) don't remember

3. Length of BAWP training program (check one)
   - 15.6 % (1) 1 or 2 days duration
   - 34.4 (2) 2-3 weeks duration (e.g. extension format)
   - 18.8 (3) 8-10 weeks duration
   - 18.8 (4) other; please describe
   - 12.5 (5) don't remember

4. What were the grade levels of the teachers represented in your training?
   - 53.1 % (1) K-12
   - 12.5 (2) K-6
   - 3.1 (3) 7-12
   - 0 (4) 7-9
   - 6.3 (5) 9-12
   - 12.5 (6) other; please describe
   - 12.4 (7) don't know or don't remember

5. Approximately what percentage of the sessions did you attend?
   - 6.3 % (1) less than 25%
   - 0 (2) 25-50%
   - 0 (3) 51-75%
   - 87.5 (4) more than 75%
   - 6.3 (5) don't remember

6. How important were each of the following reasons for your enrolling in the BAWP training program?

	Not Very Important 1	2	3	4	Very Important 5	Blank
a. to meet district or department requirements	56.3 %	6.3 %	9.4 %	0 %	6.3 %	21.9 %
b. to obtain district credit	31.3	3.1	3.1	15.6	28.1	18.8
c. to obtain university or college credit	28.1	3.1	6.3	6.3	37.5	12.8
d. to learn more about teaching writing in general	3.1	3.1	3.1	18.8	62.5	9.4
e. to learn how to handle specific writing problems	12.5	0	15.6	9.4	50	12.5
f. other: please describe	Not Coded					

7. How would you rate your level of participation in the BAWP training? (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1	2	3	4	5	Blank
6.3 %	0 %	6.3 %	31.3 %	50 %	6.3 %
Active Withdrawal		Passive Attendance		Enthusiastic Participation	

8. What has been your subsequent involvement with BAWP activities (check all that apply)
   - 75 % (1) none
   - 9 (2) BAWP open session summer participant
   - 0 (3) BAWP summer invitational fellow
   - 0 (4) BAWP consultant
   - 0 (5) BAWP coordinator

Not Coded (6) other: please describe

CELL FIVE -2-

9. Below are a list of techniques and strategies for teaching writing that might have been presented during your BAWP training. Please indicate in the space provided whether the item is one which you:

1 = Have never heard of
2 = Have heard of but do not use regularly
3 = Implemented (or revised) as a result of your BAWP experiences and use regularly
4 = Use regularly, but not necessarily as a result of your BAWP experiences

____ (1) BAWP stressed sentence writing activities (e.g. sentence combining, Jo Miles predication, etc.)
____ (2) thesis formation (e.g. Tandy's controversial theses, etc.)
____ (3) essay organization (e.g. coherence, focus, etc.)
____ (4) diction (e.g. showing not telling, etc.)
____ (5) increasing the number of different types of student writing (e.g. expressive, expository, practical, etc.)
____ (6) writing from different points of view
____ (7) writing in different voices
____ (8) using modeling or imitation of forms or styles
____ (9) dictation
____ (10) saturation reporting
____ (11) "right-brain" activities (e.g. humanities, poetry, etc.)
____ (12) teaching writing as a process through prewriting activities
____ (13) teaching writing as a process through rewriting and revising
____ (14) using writing sequences (e.g. specific to abstract; personal to public, etc.)
____ (15) use of peer feedback (writing-editing groups)
____ (16) teacher-student writing conferences
____ (17) holistic marking of student papers
____ (18) writing contracts
____ (19) individualized practice sheets
____ (20) increasing the amount of in class time devoted to writing
____ (21) increasing the number of in class writing assignments
____ (22) increasing the number of homework assignments
____ (23) writing along with student
____ (24) changing the relationship of writing to other language arts activities (e.g. reading, oral language)
____ (25) increasing number of audiences who read student work (e.g. other students, other adults, etc.)
____ (26) increasing amount of authentic written discourse (writing for real audiences)
____ (27) increasing variety of writing topics
____ (28) increasing exploratory writing (e.g. free writing, journal writing)
____ (29) increasing assignments suited to certain types of students (e.g. reluctant students, gifted students)
____ (30) increasing supportive, rewarding responses to students
____ (31) changing the grading strategies
____ (32) other (please describe)

See Appendix B for list of frequencies and item rankings for Question 9.

10. Please indicate the degree of impact that BAWP training has had, in general, on your students' attitudes and skills (explain your ratings if you wish):

	Greatly Decreased 1	2	No Change 3	4	Greatly Increased 5	Don't Know
a. students' valuing of writing	0 %	0 %	15.6 %	25 %	0 %	37.5 %
b. students' enjoyment of writing	0	0	12.5	31.3	9.4	46.9
c. students' confidence in their writing ability	0	0	6.3	37.5	6.3	50
d. students' overall writing skill	0	0	12.5	25	9.4	53.1
e. other: please describe	Not Coded					

CELL FIVE

11. In your BAWP training program, how many of the following kinds of writing assignments did you do? (Circle one response for each type of assignment)

	Number of Assignments					
a. brief assignments (5-25 minutes during a training session)	0	1-3	4-6	7-9	10 or more	don't know/ don't remember
	0%	25%	37.5%	3.1%	3.1%	31.3%
b. longer assignments (over 30 minutes perhaps completed at home)	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7 or more	don't know/ don't remember
	9.4%	43.8%	21.9%	0%	6.3%	18.8%

12. In the present school year, please estimate how many hours, on the average, you spend each week on the following activities:

	less than 1 hour	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	more than 9 hrs.	Blank
a. preparing curriculum materials	3.1%	9.4%	18.8%	12.5%	6.3%	6.3%	43.8%
b. writing along with students	25	18.8	12.5	0	0	0	43.8
c. your own creative writing	28.1	12.5	6.3	3.1	0	3.1	46.9
d. grading student papers	6.3	6.3	6.3	18.8	6.3	9.4	46.9
e. conferencing with individual students (during and after class)	9.4	18.8	12.5	9.4	0	3.1	46.9

13. Please indicate the degree of impact you think the BAWP experience has had on:

	Greatly Decreased 1	2	No Change 3	4	Greatly Increased 5	Don't Know
a. your ability to relate practices in teaching writing to theories about teaching writing	0%	0%	18.8%	31.3%	9.4%	40.6%
b. your efficiency as a writer	0	3.1	37.5	28.1	6.3	25
c. your confidence in teaching writing	0	0	15.6	28.1	28.1	28.1
d. your level of skill in teaching writing	0	0	15.6	28.1	18.8	37.5
e. other: please describe	Not Coded					

14. Please indicate overall the amount of support or opposition that you have encountered in the school or district environment in your attempts to implement changes in teaching writing. (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1	2	3	4	5	Blank
0%	6.3%	25%	12.5%	15.6%	40.6%
Strong Opposition		Neutral		Strong Support	

15. Please indicate to what extent the frequency of the following activities has changed due to your participation in the BAWP training program (and explain your ratings if you wish):

	Greatly Decreased 1	2	No Change 3	4	Greatly Increased 5	Don't Know
a. discussions with fellow teachers on the teaching of writing	0%	0%	46.9%	18.8%	6.3%	28.1%
b. collaborative activities with other teachers (e.g. team teaching)	0	0	46.9	12.5	6.3	34.4
c. taking a leadership role in the planning of school site or district writing programs	0	0	50	9.4	9.4	31.3
d. taking a leadership role in the planning of English proficiency standards or proficiency test contents (for Hart Bill requirements)	0	0	46.9	9.4	12.5	31.3
e. giving presentations at inservice or professional meetings	0	0	53.1	6.3	9.4	31.3
f. organizing or coordinating an inservice program	0	0	53.1	3.1	12.5	31.3
g. other professional activities related to the teaching of writing (please describe)	0	0	46.9	9.4	0	43.8

CELL FIVE

16. Now that you have had a chance to reflect, give an overall rating of the usefulness of the RAWP training in assisting you to become a better teacher of writing. (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1 Of little Use	2	3 Some Use	4	5 A Great Deal of Use	Blank
3.1%	0%	18.8%	25%	31.3%	21.9%

17. In light of your assessment of the overall impact of your RAWP experiences, please make any specific criticisms or endorsements of the training that you care to, or suggestions for improvement of future activities.

18. What subjects do you teach?
- 6.3% (1) English classes which focus on teaching writing
- 12.5 (2) English-writing classes plus _____ classes (specify subject(s))
- 12.5 (3) General English language/literature
- 0 (4) General English lang./lit. plus _____ classes (specify subjects)
- 59.4 (5) Other (specify) _____
- 9.4 Blank

19. How many years have you been teaching?
- 28.1% (1) 0-5 years
- 25 (2) 6-10 years
- 21.9 (3) 11-15 years
- 12.5 (4) 16-20 years
- 6.3 (5) over 20 years
- 6.3 Blank

20. What grade level(s) do you teach?
- 43.8% (1) K-6
- 6.3 (2) 7-8
- 21.9 (3) 9-12
- 3.1 (4) 13+
- 25 Blank

21. What grade level(s) did you teach at the time of your RAWP training?
- 40.6% (1) K-6
- 9.4 (2) 7-8
- 21.9 (3) 9-12
- 3.1 (4) 13+
- 25 Blank

22. What is the total number of students you teach per day?
- 12.5% (1) 1-25
- 34.4 (2) 26-50
- 3.1 (3) 51-75
- 6.3 (4) 76-100
- 6.3 (5) 101-125
- 12.5% (6) 126-150
- 0 (7) 151-175
- 0 (8) 176-200
- 0 (9) over 200
- 25 Blank

23. What is the total number of students to whom you teach writing?
- 9.4% (1) 1-25
- 34.4 (2) 26-50
- 0 (3) 51-75
- 12.5 (4) 76-100
- 6.3% (5) 101-125
- 3.1 (6) 126-150
- 0 (7) 151-175
- 0 (8) 176-200
- 0% (9) over 200
- 34.4 Blank

24. How many teachers attended your RAWP inservice meetings on the average?
- 3.1% (1) less than 10
- 25 (2) 11-20
- 12.5 (3) 21-30
- 15.6 (4) 31-40
- 3.1 (5) over 40
- 40.7 (6) don't remember

26. If you wish, please make any other comments about RAWP training, its activities or effects which have not been described in your responses to the previous questions. (Please attach additional pages if you need more space to respond.)

( ) Check here if you wish a summary of the findings.

CELL SIX

APPENDIX H

4-79 Frequency of Response for Cell Six - Summer Invitational Participants

Survey of Past Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP) Participants

1. Type of participation (check one)
   - 100 % (1) Summer Invitational Program
   - 0 (2) School district inservice (name district _____)
   - 0 (3) UC extension

2. Year of participation (check one)

School Year		Summer	
4.8 %	(1) 1974-75	12.5 %	(7) 1974
3.8	(2) 1975-76	13.5	(8) 1975
1.9	(3) 1976-77	19.2	(9) 1976
1	(4) 1977-78	30.2	(10) 1977
0	(5) 1978-79	20.2	(11) 1978
0	(6) don't remember	3.9	(12) don't remember

3. Length of BAWP training program (check one)
   - 0 % (1) 1 or 2 days duration
   - 2.9 (2) 2-3 weeks duration (e.g. extension format)
   - 32.7 (3) 8-10 weeks duration
   - 60.4 (4) other; please describe
   - 3.8 (5) don't remember

4. What were the grade levels of the teachers represented in your training?
   - 25 % (1) K-12
   - 0 (2) K-6
   - 4.8 (3) 7-12
   - 0 (4) 7-9
   - 1 (5) 9-12
   - 67.3 (6) other; please describe
   - 1.9 (7) don't know or don't remember

5. Approximately what percentage of the sessions did you attend?
   - 0 % (1) less than 25%
   - 0 (2) 25-50%
   - 0 (3) 51-75%
   - 98.1 (4) more than 75%
   - 2 (5) don't remember

6. How important were each of the following reasons for your enrolling in the BAWP training program?

	Not Very Important 1	2	3	4	Very Important 5	Blank
a. to meet district or department requirements	82.7 %	5.8 %	1 %	0 %	1 %	9.6%
b. to obtain district credit	72.1	8.7	5.8	3.8	0	9.6
c. to obtain university or college credit	57.7	12.5	12.5	4.8	1.9	10.6
d. to learn more about teaching writing in general	0	1	1.9	6.7	89.4	1
e. to learn how to handle specific writing problems	1.9	1	10.6	18.3	55.8	12.5
f. other: please describe	Not Coded					

7. How would you rate your level of participation in the BAWP training? (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1	2	3	4	5	Blank
0 %	0 %	0 %	11.5 %	86.5 %	1.9%
Active Withdrawal		Passive Attendance		Enthusiastic Participation	

8. What has been your subsequent involvement with BAWP activities (check all that apply)
   - 16% (1) none
   - 4 (2) BAWP open session summer participant
   - 21 (3) BAWP summer invitational fellow
   - 3% (4) BAWP consultant
   - 34 (5) BAWP coordinator

Not Coded (6) other: please describe

CELL SIX

9. Below are a list of techniques and strategies for teaching writing that might have been presented during your BAWP training. Please indicate in the space provided whether the item is one which you:

1 = Have never heard of
2 = Have heard of but do not use regularly
3 = Implemented (or revised) as a result of your BAWP experiences and use regularly
4 = Use regularly, but not necessarily as a result of your BAWP experiences

____ (1) BAWP stressed sentence writing activities (e.g. sentence combining, Jo Miles predication, etc.)
____ (2) thesis formation (e.g. Tandy's controversial theses, etc.)
____ (3) essay organization (e.g. coherence, focus, etc.)
____ (4) diction (e.g. showing not telling, etc.)
____ (5) increasing the number of different types of student writing (e.g. expressive, expository, practical, etc.)
____ (6) writing from different points of view
____ (7) writing in different voices
____ (8) using modeling or imitation of forms or styles
____ (9) dictation
____ (10) saturation reporting
____ (11) "right-brain" activities (e.g. humanities, poetry, etc.)
____ (12) teaching writing as a process through prewriting activities
____ (13) teaching writing as a process through rewriting and revising
____ (14) using writing sequences (e.g. specific to abstract; personal to public, etc.)
____ (15) use of peer feedback (writing-editing groups)
____ (16) teacher-student writing conferences
____ (17) holistic marking of student papers
____ (18) writing contracts
____ (19) individualized practice sheets
____ (20) increasing the amount of in class time devoted to writing
____ (21) increasing the number of in class writing assignments
____ (22) increasing the number of homework assignments
____ (23) writing along with student
____ (24) changing the relationship of writing to other language arts activities (e.g. reading, oral language)
____ (25) increasing number of audiences who read student work (e.g. other students, other adults, etc.)
____ (26) increasing amount of authentic written discourse (writing for real audiences)
____ (27) increasing variety of writing topics
____ (28) increasing exploratory writing (e.g. free writing, journal writing)
____ (29) increasing assignments suited to certain types of students (e.g. reluctant students, gifted students)
____ (30) increasing supportive, rewarding responses to students
____ (31) changing the grading strategies
____ (32) other (please describe)

See Appendix B for list of frequencies and item rankings for Question 9.

10. Please indicate the degree of impact that BAWP training has had, in general, on your students' attitudes and skills (explain your ratings if you wish):

	Greatly Decreased 1	2	No Change 3	Greatly Increased 4	5	Don't Know
a. students' valuing of writing	0 %	0 %	10.4 %	44.2%	27.9 %	17.3 %
b. students' enjoyment of writing	0	0	17.3	42.3	24	15.4
c. students' confidence in their writing ability	0	0	9.6	53.8	31.2	15.4
d. students' overall writing skill	0	0	4.8	56.7	17.3	20.2
e. other: please describe	Not Coded					

CELL SIX

11. In your BAWP training program, how many of the following kinds of writing assignments did you do? (Circle one response for each type of assignment)

	Number of Assignments					
a. brief assignments (5-25 minutes during a training session)	0	1-3	4-6	7-9	10 or more	don't know/ don't remember
	1.9%	18.3%	22.1%	20.2%	21.2%	16.3%
b. longer assignments (over 30 minutes perhaps completed at home)	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7 or more	don't know/ don't remember
	0%	16.3%	39.4%	36.5%	5.8%	1.9%

12. In the present school year, please estimate how many hours, on the average, you spend each week on the following activities:

	less than 1 hour	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	more than 9 hrs.	Blank
a. preparing curriculum materials	0 %	7.7%	30.8%	20.2%	11.5%	15.4%	13.5%
b. writing along with students	42.3	32.7	9.6	2.9	0	0	12.5
c. your own creative writing	33.5	24	8.7	7.7	1	6.7	13.5
d. grading student papers	2.9	1	11.5	16.3	25	27.9	15.4
e. conferencing with individual students (during and after class)	8.7	21.2	26.9	13.5	6.7	12.5	10.6

13. Please indicate the degree of impact you think the BAWP experience has had on:

	Greatly Decreased 1	2	No Change 3	4	Greatly Increased 5	Don't Know
a. your ability to relate practices in teaching writing to theories about teaching writing	1 %	1 %	6.7%	33.7%	56.7%	1 %
b. your efficiency as a writer	2.9	1	27.9	43.3	20.2	4.8
c. your confidence in teaching writing	0	1	5.8	32.7	59.6	1
d. your level of skill in teaching writing	0	1	3.8	39.4	51.9	3.8
e. other: please describe	Not Coded					

14. Please indicate overall the amount of support or opposition that you have encountered in the school or district environment in your attempts to implement changes in teaching writing. (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1	2	3	4	5	Blank
3.8 %	3.8 %	24 %	29.8 %	30.8%	7.7%
Strong Opposition		Neutral		Strong Support	

15. Please indicate to what extent the frequency of the following activities has changed due to your participation in the BAWP training program (and explain your ratings if you wish):

	Greatly Decreased 1	No Change 2	3	Greatly Increased 4	5	Don't Know
a. discussions with fellow teachers on the teaching of writing	0 %	1 %	11.5 %	48.1 %	37.5 %	1.9%
b. collaborative activities with other teachers (e.g. team teaching)	0	0	45.2	33.7	16.3	4.8
c. taking a leadership role in the planning of school site or district writing programs	0	0	34.6	23.1	37.5	4.8
d. taking a leadership role in the planning of English proficiency standards or proficiency test contests (for Hart Bill requirements)	1	3.8	37.5	17.3	30.8	9.6
e. giving presentations at inservice or professional meetings	0	1.9	22.1	31.7	41.3	2.9
f. organizing or coordinating an inservice program	0	1.9	34.6	25	31.7	6.7
g. other professional activities related to the teaching of writing (please describe)	0	0	20.2	11.5	25	43.3

CELL SIX -4-

16. Now that you have had a chance to reflect, give an overall rating of the usefulness of the RAWP training in assisting you to become a better teacher of writing. (Explain your response, if you wish.)

1 Of little Use	2	3 Some Use	4	5 A Great Deal of Use	Blank
1.9%	1%	38%	16.3%	76%	1%

17. In light of your assessment of the overall impact of your RAWP experiences, please make any specific criticisms or endorsements of the training that you care to, or suggestions for improvement of future activities.

18. What subjects do you teach?
41.3% (1) English classes which focus on teaching writing
17.1 (2) English-writing classes plus _____ classes
(specify subject(s))
10.6 (3) General English language/literature
4.7 (4) General English lang./lit. plus _____ classes
(specify subjects)
19.2 (5) Other (specify) _____
3.8 Blank

19. How many years have you been teaching?
3.8% (1) 0-5 years
24 (2) 6-10 years
27.9 (3) 11-15 years
23.1 (4) 16-20 years
21.2 (5) over 20 years
0 Blank

20. What grade level(s) do you teach?
9.6% (1) K-6
11.5 (2) 7-8
63.5 (3) 9-12
13.5 (4) 13+
2.9 Blank

21. What grade level(s) did you teach at the time of your RAWP training?
13.5% (1) K-6
13.5 (2) 7-8
60.6 (3) 9-12
13.5 (4) 13+
1.9 Blank

22. What is the total number of students you teach per day?
6.7% (1) 1-25
9.6 (2) 26-50
8.7 (3) 51-75
10.6 (4) 76-100
13.5 (5) 101-125
37.5% (6) 126-150
4.8 (7) 151-175
1 (8) 176-200
0 (9) over 200
7.7 Blank

23. What is the total number of students to whom you teach writing?
7.7% (1) 1-25
16.3 (2) 26-50
11.5 (3) 51-75
13.5 (4) 76-100
12.5% (5) 101-125
37.9 (6) 126-150
2.9 (7) 151-175
0 (8) 176-200
1.9 (9) over 200
7.7 Blank

24. How many teachers attended your RAWP inservice meetings on the average?
7.7% (1) less than 10
16.3 (2) 11-20
50 (3) 21-30
4.8 (4) 31-40
4.8 (5) over 40
16.3 (6) don't remember

26. If you wish, please make any other comments about RAWP training, its activities or effects which have not been described in your responses to the previous questions. (Please attach additional pages if you need more space to respond.)

( ) Check here if you wish a summary of the findings.